

MUFA's First 50 Years: The Presidents Reminisce

Prepared by the McMaster University Faculty Association

Edited by B. W. Jackson

November 2001

President's Photo on this page

Presidents of MUFA photographed on the steps of the Alumni Building, April 13, 1999

FRONT (left to right): Phyllis DeRosa-Koetting (Executive Assistant), Gerry Field, Grant Smith, Henry Schwarcz, Catherine Beattie, Frank Jones, Norman Lane, Joan Field (Executive Assistant 1975-89), Martin Johns, Norman Shrive, Jean Jones, Norman Rosenblood, Kelly McCaughey (Secretary)

MIDDLE: Ed Daniel, John Lott, Daphne Maurer, Bill Carment, Shepard Siegel, Lorraine Allan, Jack Kirkaldy, Don Dawson, David Winch, Stephen Threlkeld, John Platt

BACK: David Blewett, Berners Jackson, Les King, Marianne (Kristofferson) Walters, Gerry King, Henry Jacek

Contents

Editor's Preface — B. W. Jackson	vii	M. (Kristofferson) Walters	85
Acknowledgements		A. A. Lee	90
— T. M. K. Davison: 2001/02	ix	S. F. H. Threlkeld	91
M. W. Johns: Recollections of		D. M. Winch	93
McMaster from 1947 to 1952	1	P. L. Newbigging	100
1951/52 - 1954/55	4	D. R. Inman	103
The Beginnings: C. M. Johnston	5	D. A. Dawson	116
M. W. Johns	10	J. M. Jones	119
F. W. Waters	11	G. W. King	120
J. D. Bankier	13	H. P. Schwarcz	123
J. E. L. Graham	15	J. N. A. Lott	127
H. A. Dulmage	18	D. M. Maurer	132
H. E. Duckworth	20	G. K. Smith	139
H. W. McCready	21	E. E. Daniel	146
H. Kleerekoper	22	D. Blewett	148
N. D. Lane	22	S. Siegel	152
R. W. Thompson	26	L. Allan	154
A. H. Black	27	P. J. George	156
J. S. Kirkaldy	29	H. Jacek	157
G. S. French	37	A. L. Robb	162
B. W. Jackson	39	C. Beattie	165
D. W. Carment	42	L. J. King	168
F. N. Shrive	46	J. Platt	176
B. N. Rosenblood	47	B. Lynn	182
A. N. Bourns	52		
W. D. G. Hunter	53		
G. W. King	59		
F. E. Jones	63		
G. Field	67		
M. Levinson	69		
H. F. Guite	77		
		<i>Appendix</i>	
		A. MUFA Presidents	186
		B. MUFA Executive Members	187
		C. MUFA Staff	194

Editor's Preface

B. W. Jackson

First, MUFA's thanks to Bernadette Lynn for the idea for this book and for her part in its arrangement and organization.

Editing this collection has been a pleasure. Indeed, "Editing" is really too grand a word to apply here. My task has been mainly proof-reading: tidying some punctuation, correcting typos, very occasionally tinkering with text in the interest of clarification.

Except for some rather half-hearted, and therefore not entirely successful efforts to regularize what some may regard as fundamental matters of capitalization, hyphenization, etc., there has been, of course, no attempt to impose a uniformity of style or of presentation. Apart from its impudence, such an undertaking would be aimed at destroying one of the principal attractions of the book, which is its variety: not a variety of topics (for, indeed, given the purpose of the book, the same topics are of necessity discussed again and again) but a variety of approach and of personality, as these are reflected in style; and also a variety imposed by the passing of time and the changes, often subtle, that, over a span of fifty years, affect our ways of looking at things, and therefore our style of writing about them. So we observe in the book the changing fortunes of "collegiality", a central topic, although not always specifically, throughout most of these papers, from its somewhat tentative advocacy by the Executive Committees of the Fifties, to its acceptance and promulgation by those of the Nineties as fundamental in the operation of McMaster University.

From Parking to Pensions, from Government cutbacks and Government interference to Remuneration and the changing conditions for MUFA membership, from Promotion and Tenure to the Status of Women Faculty, from *Ta Panta* and the *Newsletter* to strikes and threats of strikes, from Campus Security to Academic Freedom, from the involvement of Senate and Board of Governors to the aspirations and rights of students, from the shape of the campus landscape to the positioning of campus buildings, of causes lost and causes won, of battles fought and refought and then fought again: these and such as these are the subjects of the story. The viewpoints of past Presidents of MUFA, and those found in its archival material, enliven the telling.

Ideally the book would consist entirely of the reminiscences of former Presidents of the Association, but, of course, many of them are no longer with us, and some others have been unable, for one reason or another, to make a submission. Where this would have resulted in gaps in the story, these have been filled by archival material, by an excerpt from Charles Johnston's book on McMaster, and by an interesting and useful "Recollection" of the early years from Martin Johns.

In the various headings of chapters or sections throughout the book, where the President's name precedes the dates of his or her term of office, what follows is the reminiscence prepared for this book; where the date of office precedes the President's name, the material that follows is archival, consisting of one or more of the following: minutes of past meetings, relevant correspondence involving members of the Executive Committee, Presidential year-end reports, excerpts from Newsletters, and other miscellaneous materials where any such materials bear on the activities of MUFA during the period concerned.

Prior to 1972 MUFA had no office space, and prior to 1974 no secretary or executive assistant. Consequently the archival material for the preceding years is scarce, and, for two of those years, non-existent. The remarkable thing is that any of it survived at all, and even more remarkable is the industry and ingenuity with which Phyllis DeRosa-Koetting and Kelly McCaughey have managed to

use it to provide a sense of MUFA's activities during those years. Following those years records are more complete, but the work of the two ladies in using them to provide a continuous narrative where the absence of certain presidential reminiscences would have left serious gaps in the story deserves not only our gratitude but our admiration.

Speaking as one whose term of office came before 1974, I find myself consumed with envy of those Presidents whose terms followed that date. Man and woman they heap praise on the secretaries and executive assistants, lauding their abilities, their diligence and their devotion, confessing that they themselves could not have managed without their help and guidance.

However, if it was my misfortune to be President of MUFA before there were such guides and counselors, it has been my good fortune, as editor of this book, to work with the two ladies named just above, and to experience the kind of help and counsel they can so abundantly provide. The construction of this book is in itself a tribute to these two, and throughout its pages can be found tributes to their predecessors in the MUFA office. The names of all of them appear at the end of this volume, and to them I think it should be dedicated, with the thanks and affection its pages so often express.

Acknowledgements

Tom Davison: 2001/2002

This book contains articles written by former Presidents of the McMaster University Faculty Association. There are also contributions from three Presidents of the University. Since there was no uniformity of approach demanded of the authors, there results a fascinating diversity of approaches to the charge to write about their "year". This variety shows that it would have been pointless to expect them to adhere to a blueprint for their submissions.

For the years for which we have no presidential reminiscences, Phyllis DeRosa Koetting has scoured our archives and, with remarkable discrimination and insight provided a seamless record by filling the gaps with excerpts from Minutes and from Presidential Reports to the AGM.

In these pages we learn that our Pension Plan has been a continual source of worry, that once there were salary increases of 10% and 15% back to back, that our mill rate has been kept really low, that a faculty member is not dismissed but removed, and in which year O.C.U.F.A became OCUFA.

Finally , I thank Dr.B.W.Jackson for his help in preparing this manuscript for production, Phyllis for overseeing the whole operation, Kelly McCaughey for typing/retyping some of the manuscripts, and Bernadette Lynn, our President in 2000/2001 for suggesting this volume and for doing so much to make it a reality.

Martin Johns

Recollections of McMaster from 1947 to 1952

Because I am one of the few faculty members still alive from the era when the Faculty Association was being created, my recollections of the University in the period from 1947 to 1952 may be of interest. These comments have nothing to do with the Faculty Association *per se*, but they may cast some light on why the association needed to be created.

The arrival of McMaster University in Hamilton in 1930 predated mine as a student by one year. It had a student body of about 400 and the departments were either one or two person departments. My father came from Brandon College to help Dr. Findlay in Mathematics in 1931. I registered in a third year pass program with a class that had already spent two years together in Toronto. I left for the University of Toronto three years later to work on my doctorate but McMaster still felt a bit like home.

When I joined the faculty in 1947 after nine years at Brandon College and a stint at Chalk River, the enrolment had risen to about seven hundred, and research, given the impetus of the war, was beginning to be important in the sciences. Dean Burke and his proteges, Harry Thode, Ron Graham, and Laurie Cragg were directing students to the M.Sc. level in chemistry and physics and there were serious beginnings in Biology and Geology. The Physics Department had spent the war years training naval recruits in radar and so had not developed any research activity. I was hired to start research in the department.

A new Head of Physics, Dr. Moon, from the Manhattan project had agreed to come to replace Dr. Dawes who was about to retire, and his projected arrival supplied one of the main reasons that I accepted an offer to come to McMaster. As it turned out, Moon never relocated on the campus, though he did buy a house in Ancaster, and I only met him once at a Saturday morning departmental meeting. We spent all morning discussing equipment that needed to be purchased and had allocated the afternoon to deal with teaching assignments for a term that was to be upon us in two weeks time. Moon never appeared at that afternoon session and I have never seen him since! It transpired that he had driven all night from Chicago to get to the meeting and that his post-prandial nap lasted until well into the evening. After patiently awaiting his arrival for two years, President Gilmour cancelled his appointment and the department grew without his input.

The faculty in 1947 could all meet comfortably in the tower room of University Hall. The meeting began with a welcome from President Gilmour and then a discourse on the nature of the University and the responsibility of the faculty in maintaining that nature. We always heard the words of the famous headmaster of Eton who reminded his gentlemen faculty that the school existed for the “young gentlemen”. (Gilmour did graciously admit that there were “ladies” both on the faculty and in the student body at McMaster.)

Then there were the inevitable directives concerning faculty attire. The requirement that all faculty should wear gowns was completely ignored by the science faculty who regarded them as dangerous appendages in a laboratory. We did however wear gowns when it became our turn to take chapel. The discourse on attire traditionally included a statement that gentlemen should wear belts rather than braces. This infuriated my father who had heard this admonition for well over a decade and he interrupted the President to ask “What does a faculty member do when a belt cannot prevent his trousers from falling down”. After the laughter had subsided, father suggested that he was quite willing to wear a belt if he were permitted to wear braces as well. I think that this was the last time that a discussion of braces appeared in the presidential welcome.

Up until about 1950, the faculty reviewed all final undergraduate marks. This operation took the best part of a day and finally became an overwhelming task. Students who failed more than two courses were ineligible to play on University teams in the following year. I vividly recall the case of two football players whose failure was going to mean defeat at the hands of the Ontario Agricultural College during the next school year. Dr. New, who was both a distinguished scholar and an ardent sportsman quickly recognized the seriousness of the situation and asked the French Department if it would not take pity on these two fine young men and raise their grades from 48 to 50. The French Department would not oblige and suggested that New's own department (history) might raise the grades of these students instead. History would not oblige and the football team was a disaster. Sports were never mentioned but everyone knew that football was really the topic on the agenda. In the following year the faculty introduced a rule that no mark between 45 and 50 could be sent to the registrar. That forced departments to make their own decisions before the faculty review occurred.

Chapel was an important feature of campus life during the Baptist era. The fact that there were no lectures scheduled between 10:15 and 11:00 a.m meant that chapel was available to all. Of course not all of the students who attended chapel were there for religious reasons. Chapel offered a wonderful opportunity to make social contacts and to keep abreast of the latest campus gossip. It was a strong integrating force for both students and faculty that we have lost in our growth to a large multi-Faculty University. Taking chapel was a formidable task for a young professor, given that President Gilmour and the heads of all the departments in the University were sitting in the front rows of the stage, right behind the chaplain of the day. The chaplain was required to follow a prescribed order of service — one or two hymns, a bible reading and a prayer. To create a unified service within that prescription was difficult and time consuming and it usually took me a full evening of sweating before I arrived at something that I felt could be offered in those august surroundings. I shall never forget the time that I arrived at the University fully prepared for chapel, and then got so involved in helping students after my first year class that I forgot to go to chapel. Gilmour, with his incomparable use of English and his knowledge of the Bible, turned to my father and said "This is the day that the sins of the son shall be visited on the father. You will have to take chapel".

Many of the senior faculty had private sources of income or had married into money. For these, the matter of faculty salaries was not an important issue. We lived next door to Chester and Mildred New for many years and Mildred and my wife Margaret were close friends. They often discussed faculty salaries. Mildred admitted that they banked all of Chester's salary and that she looked after all the housekeeping costs from her own funds. Margaret complained there was only one wage earner in her establishment and that after the taxes and food were looked after, there was not enough left to provide the four Johns children with shoes. It was only when a new breed of faculty drawn from a different stratum of society began to control the University that a strong faculty voice to raise salaries began to be heard.

Of course there was no pension fund in the University and it was accepted practice that the President would have a friendly discussion with a faculty member who had reached retirement age as to his financial ability to handle the retirement years. The President then determined the retirement gratuity on the basis of this interview. My father came to his meeting with President Gilmour in the early fifties and shocked the President when he refused to disclose his financial position. My father pointed out with some measure of fairness that he did not see why a person who had skimmed all life to save for retirement should get a small gratuity while one who had spent to the limit should get a large one. Although President Gilmour was somewhat shocked by this approach, Dad never felt that he was treated unfairly.

When the Faculty Association was organized in 1951 with my father as its first president there was no agreement as to what the function of that body should be. Very few of those involved in

developing it saw it as more than a body which could discuss matters such as salaries, pensions and conditions of work with the president of the University and there was very little of the militancy that later marked the CAUT in those early days. It took many years of evolution before the complex and comprehensive committee structure of the later years was in place. Our association started from a position of mutual trust between faculty and administration while others, such as the one at the University of Manitoba, started from one of mistrust and anger. During the eight years that I was on the faculty of Brandon College with its Manitoba affiliation, I had ample opportunity to witness the dislike that existed between controller Crawford of the University of Manitoba and the Manitoba faculty. The lack of mutual trust on that campus was in some measure transferred to the faculty of United College. The Crowe case at United College that rocked Canadian academia a few years later was almost destined to occur in Winnipeg!

1951/52 to 1954/55

The Presidents of the Faculty Association during this period were as follows:

1951/52	A. E. Johns
1952/53	E. T. Salmon
1953/54	R. M. Wiles
1954/55	R. C. McIvor

The following chapter reprinted from Charles M. Johnston's *McMaster University. Volume 2: The Early Years in Hamilton 1930-1957*¹ captures the spirit of those times.

¹Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981, pp. 215-18.

The Beginnings

Excerpt from Charles M. Johnston, *McMaster University*²

....By the mid-fifties salaries had begun to edge upward, and there was the realization that with more public and private money available for higher education and with the economy beginning to boom, remuneration would continue to climb, if not to dizzying heights, at least to levels undreamt of a decade earlier. A contributor to this improved state of affairs and to the morale of faculty generally was the Canadian Association of University Teachers, first mooted at Kingston in 1950 and then organized the following year at McGill.

Apparently no clear-cut case of academic freedom catapulted the national association and its local affiliates into being, as had been the American experience. That sort of freedom, if McMaster was typical, appeared to be in a reasonably healthy condition in Canada according to a visiting professor from the United States who taught at McMaster in the summer of 1957³. [President George] Gilmour had had occasion to dilate on the subject in these characteristically guarded terms:

It is at least arguable that academic freedom means that any member of a university has a right to express, within the university and for purposes of discussion, any views he may wish to hold or to explore, without being liable to academic penalties or to interference from outside. He may, however, to his peril overstep the bounds of decency or become guilty of libel or slander, and in this regard freedom is less complete than that guaranteed by parliamentary privilege.⁴

What prompted the organization of the CAUT were the depressingly low salary scales that had long plagued faculty at every one of the country's institutions of higher learning.⁵

If salaries were crucial in the CAUT's formation, one wonders why it was not formed in the forties. Perhaps as long as the veterans' needs had to be met — an exercise that one university head called a 'noble task'⁶ — 'frugality and cheerful self-sacrifice' had been the order of the day, though, as noted, some McMaster faculty in 1949 had not hidden their desire for improvements on this front and given Gilmour much cause for concern. But with the departure of virtually all the veterans by 1951, the feeling grew in faculty circles that the commendable self-sacrifice of the post-war years ought now to give way to a reasonable pursuit of greater remuneration for lecture hall and

²*McMaster University. Volume 2: The Early Years in Hamilton 1930-1957.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981, pp. 213-18. Material in square brackets was added by the author.

³William D. Barns, 'Some Observations on the Teaching of History in a Canadian University,' *West Virginia History: A Quarterly Magazine*, xix, i (October 1957), [80]-7. [Barns later established an undergraduate scholarship at McMaster.]

⁴Gilmour Memorandum on the Relations of Faculty Advisers to Students' Council and Societies, March 1948.

⁵See V. C. Fowke, 'Professional Association: A History of the CAUT,' in George Whalley, ed., *A Place of Liberty: Essays on the Government of Canadian Universities* (Toronto, 1964), Appendix B, 195-215.

⁶Claude T. Bissell, *Halfway up Parnassus: A Personal Account of the University of Toronto, 1932-1971* (Toronto, 1974), 44-5.

laboratory efforts and that this could best be assured through collective action.

J. E. L. [Jack] Graham, the economist recently appointed to the faculty and McMaster's representative at the McGill meetings, was delegated to organize a local affiliate of the CAUT at the university. The response from the faculty, he later recalled, was not overwhelmingly enthusiastic, but at the same time no overt hostility greeted the scheme either.⁷ In all, forty-eight of the faculty's eligible personnel joined the Faculty Association that was established in May 1951. The membership was open to all those in the faculties of the Divinity School, University College, and Hamilton College 'who [held] the rank of assistant professor or higher, and to all lecturers who [had] completed one year of service at...[the] University.' Administrative officers — the president, the principals, the deans, and the registrar — could not be members.

Those who were excluded, notably Gilmour, adopted a 'wait and see' attitude and allowed a cautious acceptance of the Association. Some alumni were concerned about its implications. Gilmour's response to them revealed his own feeling about the body after it had been operating for several years: 'It is not really a trade union' he assured one correspondent, who had plainly concluded that it was,

but...a Canadian counterpart of the American Association of University Teachers [*sic*]...Here, we have had the happiest relations with [this] Faculty Association, and it gives faculty members...a channel for presenting to the administration problems of salary and other matters that affect the teaching staff... There are many things [in academia]...that badly need attention in Canada. It is a good thing to have administrative people like myself kept aware of the fact that these problems exist.

At the same time Gilmour happily noted that, by their very nature, university instructors were 'hardy individualists and...strong for promotion and increments by merit rather than by mere seniority.' Gilmour ended by saying how gratified he was that 'so far, all is quiet on this western front.'⁸ That the situation was not ablaze at McMaster may in part have resulted from recent salary adjustments that would bring 'our salary levels,' as Gilmour advised Premier [Leslie] Frost, 'to approximately the level in effect in two other Ontario universities.'⁹ Another cause of serenity on the McMaster scene was the conservative inclination of the Association's leadership, drawn as it was from the senior and middle ranks of the faculty. The first president of the body was A. E. Johns, who, though once bold enough to confront the indomitable Howard Whidden on salary matters,¹⁰ urged the membership at its first meeting in 1951 that 'matters of too contentious a nature' not be brought up for discussion.¹¹ Loyalty, like patriotism, was still operative. The Association's executive thanked the administration for its 'sympathetic attitude' and 'full co-operation' and assured [it] that the Association's submissions did not imply the 'slightest lessening of loyalty on the part of faculty

⁷Interview with Prof. J. E. L. Graham, 20 June 1977. [Graham subsequently revealed one possible exception: the colleague who wrote a cryptic "Stalin" on the blackboard of the lecture room used for the organizational meeting.]

⁸General Correspondence, 1955-6, Gilmour to W. H. Cranston, 19 September 1956.

⁹Package 14, Department of Education File, Gilmour to Leslie Frost, 1 March 1956.

¹⁰Interview with Prof. Harold Freeman, 19 July 1977.

¹¹Minutes of the McMaster University Faculty Association, Executive Committee, 3 December 1951. These are available in the offices of the Faculty Association.

members.¹² This was not the stuff of ugly confrontation.

The standing committees that were shortly struck to serve the Association reflected its primary concerns — scholarly finance, salaries and pensions, conditions of work, and university policy. The second and third are self-explanatory, but scholarly finance and university policy beg some elaboration. The former was concerned with such matters as sabbatical leaves, travel expenses incurred in attending meetings of learned societies, and varieties of research and publication grants. University policy covered measures ensuring that the university would remain ‘primarily a place for higher learning.’ At first the committee formed to deal with the issue addressed itself largely to questions affecting the undergraduates — their athletic activities, dress and deportment, and extracurricular activities. What had hitherto been matters for private conversations and faculty common room discussions were now incorporated in the agenda of a fully constituted public forum.

The concern long expressed by some was that athletics had at times been given precedence over academic studies. Dean [Herbert] Armstrong had explicitly complained about the ‘sloppiness’ of what he called ‘football bums’ and about the distractions of ‘football weekends,’ though a short time earlier he had reported that the ‘average performance of...team...members is well above the average of the student body as a whole.’¹³ After an investigation of the problem, real or imagined, which involved a review of the failure rate of those who participated heavily in organized sports, and an assurance from Ivor Wynne, the athletic director, that he would ‘co-operate completely’ with the faculty, the committee reported its belief that the ‘athletic situation is good.’

....However satisfied they might have been with athletics, the Faculty Association’s committee on university policy was far less sanguine about the students’ other extracurricular activities and the degree to which they were threatening McMaster’s ‘higher learning.’ What had been a source of gratification to students — the proliferation of clubs and societies in the early fifties — was a cause for alarm in certain faculty quarters. The administration also expressed some disquiet, though it comforted itself with the thought that the clubs represented ‘wholesome interests.’¹⁴ Noting that there were as many as fifty student organizations on campus, the committee singled out the Operatic Society as the greatest time-consumer, holding in the session 1951-52 no fewer than sixty meetings eating up over one hundred and fifty hours. In the end, however, the committee was unable to suggest improvements that would correct a situation which it deplored.¹⁵ Ultimately, in fact, the committee had difficulty even determining precisely what its function ought to be, and by the mid-fifties had vanished without a trace.

Obviously the urgent questions facing the Association had to do with salaries, pensions, and ‘scholarly finance’ rather than with student clubs and deportment, matters that — like automobile parking in a later generation — were virtually beyond understanding. But the financial questions, which after all had been crucial in bringing the Association to life, were tangible, discussible, even resolvable, or so it was firmly believed. As for scholarly funding, the committee responsible, after noting that ‘no regular system of recurrent long leave’ or sabbaticals had been in operation at McMaster, reported that the university was actively planning to bring one in for permanent faculty. (Although Gilmour revealed that sabbatical leaves had been granted with ‘full pay’ before the first world war, he agreed that nothing like what the Association was requesting had been available for

¹²Faculty, 1947-58, A. E. Johns and R. M. Wiles to Gilmour, 25 April 1952 and 18 December 1953.

¹³Package 18, Annual Reports, 1950-1, Armstrong’s; and 1949-50, 2 June 1950.

¹⁴BYB, 1950-1, 150.

¹⁵Report of the Faculty Association Committee on University Policy; Reports, 1951-2, 3-4.

nearly half a century.¹⁶) The president recognized the need to stimulate and attract scholarship and to plan a program of fully or partially paid sabbatical leaves. Such a scheme would also be an exercise in the university's enlightened self-interest. 'If men of scholarly ability are harnessed to the point of exhaustion to the task of undergraduate teaching, as may happen,' Gilmour warned the Senate in 1956, 'the university can easily become a place for the prolongation of secondary education'. 'Scholars' he continued 'must have opportunity for academic leisure and research, otherwise the university either loses or fails to attract men of brilliance and promise.'¹⁷

With respect to research and other scholarly grants, a survey underscored what most faculty knew already, that Hamilton College, unlike its arts counterpart, was fairly affluent under a 'well-planned system' introduced shortly after the institution was established in 1948. This amounted to what was called the 'summer stipend' — a research honorarium for summer work. Nothing comparable for the arts was approved until the sixties, when their own more ambitious graduate programs were instituted. In the interval the humanist and social scientist had to rest content with research awards 'on a much smaller scale'. Nevertheless, if modest, they recompensed George Haddow, for instance, for his travelling expenses to Paris in the summer of 1953.¹⁸

The fear that Hamilton College's salaries might soon exceed those in other sectors of the campus prompted the following commentary from Dean Armstrong: 'An important feature of our faculty is its essential unity. It will be most desirable to keep as great a degree of uniformity as possible in the salary scales of University College and Hamilton College instructors (or a real source of irritation will spring up).¹⁹ Irritation enough would shortly arise when senior men in arts discovered that while they were still forced to put up with cramped accommodations and a sharing arrangement for offices with their colleagues, 'junior men in Hamilton College [can] have their own individual quarters.'²⁰ All the same, some arts objectives were achieved at this time when arrangements were made to have membership fees in learned societies rendered income-tax exempt and when more realistic funds were made available for travel to research centres and attendance at conferences.

The question of salaries pre-empted most of the hours that the CAUT and its affiliates allotted to their concerns. The central body undertook a careful review of financial affairs at universities elsewhere in Ontario and Canada. Notwithstanding the appreciable efforts of the Social Science and Humanities Research Councils to do something of the sort earlier, an authoritative comparative study of salaries, pensions, and working conditions was for the first time prepared for the benefit of the profession. The results underlined the need at McMaster for making a substantial improvement in the faculty's financial situation. In its brief submitted in 1953 the local Faculty Association disclosed that at virtually every rank — the only exception was that of lecturer — McMaster lagged behind not only the University of Toronto, the nation's pacesetter, which was to be expected, but also such institutions as Alberta, Queen's, Saskatchewan, and McGill. At the full professorial position McMaster was nearly in the cellar. Of those institutions surveyed, only the University of New Brunswick (\$4480) was lower than McMaster (\$5271). '[The] higher the academic rank,' the Association brief concluded, 'the greater is the discrepancy encountered

¹⁶Miscellaneous Correspondence, L, 1945-9, Gilmour to R. D. Laurie, 6 December 1948.

¹⁷RD, G. P. Gilmour, 'The background and purpose of charter proposals, 19 Oct. 1956,' 5.

¹⁸Package 19, Annual Reports, 1952-3, Haddow's, 10 June 1953.

¹⁹Package 18, Annual Reports, 1949-50, Armstrong's, 2 June 1950.

²⁰Package 19, Annual Reports, 1954-5, Armstrong's.

between the McMaster salary schedule and that of the representative Canadian situation.²¹ It was the task of remedying this state of affairs that Gilmour and his colleagues had to shoulder in the mid-fifties, at a time when new appointments were imperative, and reasonably attractive ones at that. The gratification of incumbent personnel had to be ensured along with the necessary inducements for recruiting reinforcements of quality, long a priority in Gilmour's office.

²¹McMaster Association of University Teachers: Brief Regarding the Salaries of the Full-Time Academic Staff, 23 February 1953, 2.

Martin Johns

1955/1956

There appear to be no minutes on file for the McMaster University Faculty Association for this year. Thus there are no aids to jog my memory of what happened during my term as president of the Association. I know that the Executive met regularly and that the association continued to develop its committees and its areas of concern. We were still in the process of establishing its independence from the Faculty Club that had been more of a social club than a force to influence University decisions.

The only vivid memory I have of that year involves an incident that followed an Executive meeting in the Alumni building. As I left the building, a tenured member of the Geography Department stopped me and told me that the University had summarily dismissed him and that the Association would have to deal with a matter of wrongful dismissal. I was both surprised and shocked and promised to look into the matter immediately.

The Vice President Administration of Hamilton College at that time was Mike Hedden. Mike had been a personal friend ever since I had joined the faculty nine years earlier, his office being located in the Nuclear Research Building just a few doors from my own. I knew him as a perceptive and thoughtful member of the administration and could not believe that he would be party to a faculty dismissal without serious reasons. When I told Mike that I had a case of wrongful dismissal to discuss with him, he responded by pulling a letter out of his desk and suggesting that I read it before we began our discussion. The letter was a letter of resignation from the faculty member concerned. And of course the letter ended the discussion.

I was well aware that the faculty member concerned had been a thorn in the flesh of the Administration for some years, making pronouncements on environmental matters concerning the Niagara escarpment. Those pronouncements were scientifically valid. However, his insistence that they represented the official position of the University was quite uncalled for and had created much embarrassment for the University Administration. His letter had given the University the perfect means of dealing with the situation. His resignation was simply accepted with regret.

When I pointed out to the faculty member concerned that he had resigned, he became quite angry and told me that of course he had not intended to resign. All he had been trying to do was to underline the seriousness of the issues that he was raising. I am not sure that I was ever able to convince him that a resignation was a resignation — period.

1956/57 to 1963/64

1956/1957

F. W. Waters, President

December 17 1956: “Resolved that the Faculty Association express to President Gilmour its appreciation of the concern he has steadfastly shown in maintaining and enhancing the beauty of this campus, and its hope that he will not find it necessary to compromise in this regard in the face of problems arising from the passage and parking of automobiles. The Faculty Association respectfully urges that as a matter of general principle the policy be adopted of locating future parking lots on the periphery of the campus and of cultivating deliberately in the central areas the quiet atmosphere which we believe should characterize a university campus.”

December 17, 1956: Salary brief submitted to the Administration

Supported a CAUT proposal for a national minimum salary scale as follows:

Rank	Minimum Salary Scale
Lecturer	\$ 6,000
Assistant	\$ 8,000
Associate	\$11,000
Professor	\$14,000

“...the Association suggests that the University should take a major step towards the proposed national minimum salary scale. It therefore makes the following recommendations for an interim adjustment:

- (1) An increase in the minimum salary for each rank of the full-time academic staff to the following levels:

Lecturer	\$ 5,000
Assist. Professor	\$ 6,000
Assoc. Professor	\$ 8,000
Professor	\$10,000
- (2) Actual salaries of all full-time academic staff to be not less than the relevant minima prescribed above, and the distribution of salaries within any given rank to be determined with due regard both to the new minimum for that rank and to considerations of merit.
- (3) These adjustments to be effective July, 1957.”

February 11, 1957: Brief presented by the Committee on Scholarly Finance

Proposed institution of a Summer Stipend Scheme for University College, the Divinity School, and the Department of Nursing Education, and Special Grants-in-aid for other scholarly activities.

Two main categories of projects for which financial support would be provided:

1. Scholarly research leading to the publication of books, articles, etc. (at rates payable on the same terms as the Summer Stipend Scheme in Hamilton College (see C. M. Johnston article in this book, p. 8).
2. Other scholarly activities such as travel projects, especially for instructors in modern languages, and research and course development. A Special Grants-in-Aid category of financial aid should be instituted and should be financially equivalent to the amounts payable under the Stipend Scheme.

Applicants should ordinarily hold the rank of Assistant Professor or higher and should be permanent members of the University. Applications should be sent to the Head of Departments and to the Deans, who were charged with striking a special committee to determine the eligibility of the applicants. The stipends would be set at the rate of one-fifth of salary for two months of summer work up to the maximum rates then in effect at Hamilton College. The proposal allowed for variable periods of work ranging from a minimum period of one month to a maximum period of two months, the stipend in each case to be adjusted proportionately. Grants from other sources would be deducted from the University stipend.

It was felt that “the extension of the summer stipend scheme to University College, the Divinity School, and the Department of Nursing Education, and the Special Grants in Aid for the whole University staff would be most beneficial to the entire faculty. Knowing and appreciating the aim of the University to make available adequate opportunities for research and scholarly advancement, and for pedagogical development, the members of the Faculty Association hope that these proposals may soon be implemented.”

February 11, 1957: Brief regarding Pensions prepared by the Special Enquiries Committee and approved by the membership.

1. That the present pension plan be replaced by a modified unit-purchase plan under which an annuity of 2.65 percent of annual salary would be bought for each year of pensionable service and that the cost be shared between the university and the individual in the ratio 2:1. It is further recommended, as an interim arrangement, that contributions from those who are fifty-five or more years of age at the time the plan is introduced should not exceed 7 ½ percent of salary.
2. That the possibility of allowing contributors the option of having some part of their pension contributions allocated to the purchase of equities be investigated.
3. That contributors be allowed, if the circumstances warrant, to retire at an earlier or later age than the normal and that the pension, adjusted accordingly, be commenced from the actual date of retirement if the contributor wishes.

- 4 That the Administration give special consideration to the case of retired staff members or of those who will be retiring in the near future and whose pensions are inadequate under present conditions.

AGM — April 30, 1957:

Group Insurance Plan (approved in principle by Association members)

The Plan, proposed by the Administration, would provide “group insurance coverage equal to one year’s salary, rounded to the next higher thousand dollars, up to age 60 and coverage equal to one-half of this amount from age 60 to age 65; the premium payable by each person insured would be 35 cents per month per thousand, the balance being paid by the University; anyone who preferred to remain outside the plan would be free to do so; there would be no medical examination for those who entered the plan at its inception; the plan would provide for payment of the full amount of the policy over a period of time in the event of total and permanent disability.”

INTERESTING TO NOTE:

The Executive Officers of the CAUT for 1956/57:

President	H. McCreedy, McMaster
Past President	V. C. Fowke, Saskatchewan
Vice-Presidents	W. Dixon, UBC
	M. S. Donnelly, Manitoba
	J. C. Falardeau, Laval
Secretary:	N. D. Lane, McMaster
Treasurer	R. C. McIvor, McMaster

1957/1958

J. D. Bankier, President

November 27, 1957: Recommended increases were Professors — 20%; Associate Professors — 16%; Assistant Professors — 16%; and Lecturers — 11%

March 8, 1958: Pension brief submitted in February 1957 was revised by the Association to address technical difficulties which were uncovered. The revised brief was approved by the membership and resubmitted to the Administration.

The plan in effect when this proposal was made provided for the purchase for each year of pensionable service an annuity equal to 1.5% of annual salary. The faculty member contributed 5% of salary and the University put in the additional sum needed to purchase an annuity of the required amount. Both the faculty member’s and the University’s contributions were vested immediately in the faculty member. The February 1957 Brief made the following recommendations:

- I. Each contributor on reaching retirement age would be entitled to receive an annual pension of 2% of his maximum salary for every

year of service on the regular (“permanent”) staff of the University or of the Divinity College. The pension would be payable for life with a guaranteed minimum of five years. Normal retirement age is understood to be sixty-five, but in the event of prior retirement from the university, the accrued pension can be collected starting at age 60. If the individual terminates his employment with the university before age 60, he may elect to have his annuity payments begin at any time after reaching that age. If he retires by mutual agreement between ages sixty and sixty-five, he may elect to have his annuity begin immediately.

2. The plan would be financed by contributions from staff members of 5% of salary in each year and by additional contributions from the University to make up the total amount required to purchase the annuity referred to in (1) above. The plan could be introduced by increasing the annuity purchased for each contributor to 2% of each year’s salary and also, in order to keep the accumulated pension in line with the individual’s current salary, the University might either contribute additional sums as resources become available or it might leave the final adjustment to be made when the individual reaches pensionable age.
3. A contributor who leaves the employ of the University after less than five years’ pensionable service would retain title to the pension purchased in his name with the regular year-to-year contributions of the University and himself but no additional contribution would be made to bring his accumulated pension from 2% of his average salary for each year of pensionable service up to 2% of his final salary for each year of pensionable service.
4. A contributor who leaves the employ of the University after five or more years’ service would retain an annuity, beginning at age 65, equal to 2% of his final salary for each year of pensionable service.
5. The capital value of the pension would be determined in accordance with the formula described in (1) above but the individual would be allowed the widest possible range of options concerning the form of his pension, e.g., he might wish to have a smaller pension during his lifetime in order to provide for any dependants who might survive him, etc.
6. The final pension would not exceed 70% of the contributor’s maximum annual salary or such other maximum as the appropriate government authorities may determine.
7. The Faculty Association feels that the proposal outlined above will provide satisfactory pensions for members who may retire in the future but it does nothing for those who have retired before this plan comes into effect. For these retired members it is proposed that the pension be based on the salaries being paid at the time the plan is introduced for the academic rank from which the member retired and that the pension be increased to 2% of this amount for each year of service by a special contribution from the University. It is felt that

in this way the University will be providing for its former faculty members an income which will be more appropriate to present conditions and which will recognize the years of devoted and distinguished service which these scholars have given.

8. The Faculty Association would very much like to see the new plan brought into effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

March 19, 1958: McMaster University Expansion Fund

The Faculty Association, upon request from the University President, to conduct the campaign for faculty contributions to the McMaster University Expansion Fund. Letters from the Executive were sent to all full-time staff along with pledge cards and campaign material. In order to preserve anonymity, the pledge cards were collected by members of the Executive in sealed envelopes and submitted to the Bursar's Office which would send out receipts. The Executive suggested the following minimum contributions over a three- year period: Professors - \$8.00/month; Associate Professors - \$6.00/month; Assistant Professors - \$4.00/month; and Lecturers - \$2.00/month. If everyone contributed at this rate, they hoped to collect \$15,000 over the three-year period.

1958/1959

J. E. L. Graham, President

December 19, 1958: The Association Executive unanimously endorsed the following report made by the Special Inquiries Committee:

Several concerns have arisen in the minds of members of the Special Committee on Inquiries regarding Freedom and Tenure, growing out of the Crowe case, [at United College in Winnipeg, Manitoba] which we hope will have due consideration by the C.A.U.T. In the interests of a better understanding that will render any repetition of this calamity impossible in future, some matters call for clarification and mutual undertakings as between faculty members and College and University administrators.

1. **The breakdown of personal relations** and the apparently complete failure, primarily on the part of the Administration, to understand the nature of proper relationships in an academic community is deplorable. The evidence points to a long-standing division in the Faculty of such serious proportions that it was not possible for the local Association to act on the proposition that the C.A.U.T. send a Committee of Inquiry. The division appears to center largely on the problem of relationships with and loyalty to the administration of a church-related college. The measure of privacy a professor may expect and the nature of co-operation to which the administration is entitled had apparently never been defined in this case, if at all discussed.

2. **Dismissal without a show of cause** or even a hint of the nature of complaints, in a case which did not involve either incompetence or moral turpitude, and subsequent to quite recent promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is incomprehensible.
3. The clause in the Act establishing the college which suggests that tenure is “during the pleasure” of the Board of Regents with the obvious interpretation that tenure ceases when the “displeasure” of the Administration is incurred arouses deep misgivings.
4. The disturbing evidence of “bad faith” at several points in the correspondence and negotiations calls for a clarification of administrative responsibility and ethical obligation:
 - a) the use made of a private letter and the claims that it was neither “read to the Board” nor used as a basis for action against Professor Crowe – no other evidence being adduced for the dismissal.
 - b) the use to which Federal grants, ostensibly made for the purpose of increasing the salaries of Faculty members, were put.
 - c) the withdrawal of promised co-operation with the C.A.U.T. Committee by the Administration over the size of the Committee, a point never previously raised.
 - d) the insulting demand upon the C.A.U.T. representatives on arrival for affidavits of impartiality.
5. The fact that the C.A.U.T. is not a legal entity means that the representatives could find themselves (even yet) held responsible personally for their report. If the College Administration were minded to take legal action it could only be against the representatives personally and the officers of the C.A.U.T. as individuals.

December 19, 1958: Basic recommendation of the salary brief was “that for the 1959/60 academic year the present actual average salaries of the several ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and lecturer be increased by 15%, 15%, 12% and 10% respectively.”

March 20, 1959: The Executive endorsed the following recommendations of the Committee on Campus Problems:

- There are several minor annoyances for the teaching and research staff on Saturday mornings – which is a working period for them. Administrative offices on the other hand are closed up tight. We feel that at least a skeleton staff to provide telephone service, mail delivery and pick-up from buildings and emergency secretarial help would make our Saturday morning work more effective.
- There is serious difficulty reported from outside the University over contacting

by telephone Faculty members in University Hall who are not at that moment in their offices. Some person should be made available through the switchboard to receive messages and see that the message is conveyed as soon as possible to the Faculty member, either by putting a note in his mail box – or better still, on his desk. This is suggested as a courtesy to those outside the University who have business with Faculty members.

- The above problem would be most easily solved by the appointment of Departmental Secretaries: and this would also help to solve the problem above – each department or a group of departments determining whether secretarial help might be required on Saturday mornings.

April 7, 1959: Pension Plan

The McMaster University Faculty Association wishes to state its concern about the fact that the two briefs on pensions which were submitted to the University Administration during the last two years have still not led to any changes in the pension plan and expresses its hope that the University Administration will soon find it possible to deal with this important matter effectively.

In particular, this Association feels that those faculty members who are going to retire in the near future should no longer be kept in uncertainty as to the pension improvements they can expect, and that the pensions of faculty members already retired should be given urgent and favourable consideration.

April 7, 1959: Proposal regarding Group Life and Disability Insurance submitted to the Administration.

While it is fully recognized that the primary responsibility for adequate life and disability insurance must rest with the individual, it is felt by this Association that the collective means of aiding the individual's efforts to achieve a reasonable measure of security, through suitable group insurance plans, should not be neglected because of the obvious advantage of relatively low cost inherent in such plans.

With this principle in mind, it is the considered opinion of this Association that the present group life insurance and its disability benefit clause do not provide as much insurance coverage as could reasonably be expected from a group insurance scheme, and therefore the following proposals are made to improve the situation.

- (1) The present group life insurance is to be doubled, i.e. increased to the extent that all faculty members are covered for an amount of insurance equal to twice their regular annual salary carried forward to the next complete thousand dollars.
- (2) The cost of this insurance is to be distributed between faculty member and University in the same manner as under the present scheme.
- (3) This new group life insurance is to provide proportionately the same disability benefits as the present one and thus to give twice the present coverage.
- (4) An additional group disability insurance is to be instituted which provides for payment of half salary over periods of total disability up to the age of 65.

- (5) The cost of this insurance is to be shared, in equal parts, by faculty member and University.
- (6) Faculty members should have the option, subject to contract provisions, to purchase at their own cost additional coverage within the framework of the group disability insurance.

1959/1960
H. A. Dulmage, President

Sabbatical Leaves at McMaster in 1959/60: Letter from H. A. Wood, MUFA Secretary to the Chairman of the Committee on Sabbaticals at Waterloo University College, December 1, 1959:

...In reply to your question about sabbatical leave at McMaster, I must report that no recognized system exists here. If a faculty member receives a research or travel grant of some distinction which involves his absence from the University during the normal lecture period, the Administration makes every effort to permit him to accept the grant. A substitute is sought after and some salary continues during the period of absence. However, no individual has a right to such leave, and unless a considerable part of his income during the period of absence comes from an outside source, the University will not encourage him or assist him to go.

We have spent a little time discussing the pros and cons of our situation, but, for the moment we are more concerned with salaries and pensions than with Sabbatical leave.

December 18, 1959: Salary Brief, which was submitted to the Administration on January 4, 1960

“pointed out that McMaster salaries relative to those at Toronto have declined over the past year. It is recommended that average salaries here in each rank be made equal to those at Toronto, and that this be achieved through the following percentage increases: Professors, 9%; Associates, 12%; Assistants, 10% and Lecturers, 14%”.

“In the discussion which followed [at the General Meeting], the question of the effectiveness of salary briefs was raised, and the suggestion made that **less mild language** might be more fruitful.”

Subsequently at the AGM on May 3, 1960, the Salaries Committee Chair, F. E. Jones reported that

...the University administration is recommending to the Board of Governors that the University of Toronto salary scale be adopted here by 1961. Percentage increases in salary for the various ranks will probably be slightly over half of the amounts recommended by the Association in the Salaries Brief presented to the administration earlier in the year. There had thus been a definite change in the thinking of the administration with respect to salaries, a change which is due in large

part to the action taken by several other universities, notably McGill and the University of British Columbia, in adopting the Toronto salary scale.

April 11, 1960: University Government

Dr. [F. E.] Jones pointed out that the Association might well establish a Committee to deal with University Government. Faculty representation on the Board should be sought. Dr. Duckworth cited as symptomatic of the lack of faculty control, the recent setting up of a study week in March without faculty consultation. He suggested, however, that the matter of University Government should be more a matter of concern for the entire Faculty than that of the Association alone, and the main function of the Association should simply be to start the ball rolling. The matter is to be referred to next year's Executive.

May 3, 1960: Brief Concerning Telephone Service prepared by the Campus Problems Committee and endorsed by the membership.

The Campus Problems Committee has received numerous, strongly-worded complaints about the inconvenience resulting from the lack of office telephones. No discoverable principle, such as rank or seniority of need, governs the allotting of telephones, and the service provided in the various buildings is far from equal. Considering the costly equipment provided to facilitate work at the University, it seems unreasonable that faculty members should be constantly hindered in the conduct of normal departmental business through lack of telephones. Many faculty members waste time daily in delivering messages from office to office and across campus that could be more efficiently transmitted by telephone. The improvement of telephone service to faculty members is therefore recommended by this Committee as an economy measure.

Some departments presently located in the Engineering Building (Geography, History, Philosophy, Sociology, e.g.) have been provided with a single telephone, installed in the office of the Head or Chairman. This arrangement requires the Head or Chairman to act as messenger for the other members of the department. Consequently, his work is often interrupted and his office frequently occupied while other members of the department engage in telephone conversation. Furthermore, when the Head or Chairman is out of his office, all other members of the department are without telephone service.

May 3, 1960: Administration proposes new Pension Plan for Association's review:

The Chairman [of the Pension Committee], Dr. C. C. Potter, reported much activity on the part of his Committee. The committee had reviewed a new pension proposal prepared by a subcommittee of the Board, which would have increased the pension formula from 1½% to 2% of career earnings, but would have raised the retirement age for men from 65 to 68. The proposed plan was appraised by the actuarial firm of William Mercer and Company, which appraisal confirmed the belief of members of the committee that the entire cost of the increase in the pension formula would be met by the deferral of retirement. The Mercer report, however, pointed to certain administrative changes by which a 2% formula could be obtained without any change in the retirement age, and with little or no additional cost to the University.

The committee had recommended that these changes be instituted, but had also pointed out that for the University faculty, the late entry into permanent employment that results in even a 2% formula provides a pension well below that which would be obtained by personnel engaged in business. A further recommendation had therefore been made, namely that the pension formula be set at 2½% of career earnings. This would yield a pension of approximately one half of the final year's earnings under normal conditions.

An important development is that members of the Association's Pension Committee have been invited to participate in the deliberations of the Pensions Subcommittee of the Board. It has also been indicated that the Association wishes to be represented on any committee set up to handle a pensions trustee plan.

1960/1961
H. E. Duckworth, President

May 9, 1961: Report of the Committee on University Government as recounted in the minutes.

Dr. McCready presented the report, a copy of which was in the hands of members. The main question raised by the report concerned the need felt by some members of the Association for a strengthening of the Faculty Council. The committee recommended the addition of 11 Full Professors to the Council as a step in this direction.

The lengthy discussion arising from this proposal showed three main bodies of opinion:

- a) that addition of senior members of faculty would increase the willingness of the Administration to consider sympathetically the Council's views.
- b) that the Council should be more representative than it is now, i.e., that younger faculty members should be included, quite apart from any who may already be on Council as chairmen of departments.
- c) that the natural administrative unit is the department, so that the chairman of a department should be considered an adequate representation of the views and interests of their colleagues in the department.

A straw vote was taken on the question whether the Faculty Association would favour encouraging members of Faculty Council to press for greater representation, or rather defer the entire question for consideration by the new Standing Committee.

It was moved (McCready, Shein) that a Standing Committee on University Government be set up. Passed.

It was agreed that the Standing Committee be instructed to study procedures being followed in Canadian universities in cases of dismissal of full-time teaching staff. Such a study would precede discussions with the Administration at McMaster, on the basis of which procedures could be worked out that would be satisfactory to Administration and Faculty alike.

Dr. Middleton raised the question of the uncertainty felt by some department chairmen as to the exact nature of their responsibility and authority. Could a handbook be prepared by the Administration, dealing with this matter and also explaining the Administration's understanding of tenure, promotion procedures, group and medical insurance, etc., and explaining the function of such bodies as the Senate and the Faculty Council. The suggestion was referred to the Standing committee for consideration.

Dr. Bankier asked whether it would be helpful for faculty members to be on the Board of Governors in addition to the Deans. The matter was referred to the Standing Committee for consideration.

On a motion by Drs. McCready and Shein, the report of the Committee on University Government was accepted. It was further agreed that the Standing Committee be urged to consider early the question of strengthening Faculty Council representation, so that a report could be made to the Association in the autumn of 1961.

1961/1962
H. W. McCready, President

May 9, 1962: Termination of Appointment

Dr. Kleerekoper commented on the statement regarding termination of appointment either by resignation or by dismissal that had been circulated to the members. He expressed the committee's concern that it would be possible to establish measures which would give the Administration support both in terms of the time at which resignations were made to the Administration and in terms of the cases where dismissal might seem necessary. Dr. McCready mentioned that in a recent discussion of the matter with Dr. Gilmour it had been pointed out that in the last few decades at least there had been no cases of clear dismissal. Nevertheless the committee felt that it is desirable to have established procedures which would be recognized by Administration and Faculty alike.

After both parts of the statement on termination of appointment had been discussed and emended in several places, *it was agreed* that the statement go forward to the Administration as a brief from the Faculty Association.

May 9, 1962: Membership

Dr. Johns drew attention to the fact that the deans are not members of the Association, and reminded members that the exclusion of deans and other administrative officers had seemed necessary at the time when the Association came into being. At that time members had felt that administrative officers might exercise too great influence in the association drawn from what then was a small faculty. Dr. Johns went on to ask whether this limitation on membership is still necessary. *It was agreed* that this matter would be passed on to the Executive for study.

1962/1963
H. Kleerekoper, President

April 5, 1963: Summary of Salary Brief that was submitted to the Administration in January 1963.

Recommendation 1

That the salary floors for the four ranks be raised to the levels: Professor, \$16,000; Associate Professor, \$13,000; Assistant, \$10,000, Lecturer, \$7,000, in steps as follows, beginning in 1964-65:

	<u>1962-3</u>	<u>1963-4</u>	<u>1964-5</u>	<u>1965-6</u>	<u>1966-7</u>
Professor	11,700	13,000	14,000	15,000	16,000
Associate Professor	9,000	10,000	11,000	12,000	13,000
Assistant Professor	7,020	7,750	8,500	9,250	10,000
Lecturer	5,400	5,800	6,200	6,600	7,000

Recommendation 2

That whenever the salary scale is changed, the relative position of the medians and averages with respect to the floors be retained.

Recommendation 3

That the normal rate of progress of a university teacher through the ranks be unaffected by a change in the salary scale.

Recommendation 4

That the normal rate of progress of a university teacher through the ranks be: lecturer and/or post-doctorate fellow, 3 years; assistant professor, 6 years; associate professor, 6 years; and thereafter, professor until retirement.

Recommendation 5

That the administration announce salary adjustments earlier than heretofore.

1963/1964
N. D. Lane, President

June 1963: A CAUT Committee was formed at McMaster “to study the merits of proposed trimester plans for Canadian universities”. The Committee consisted of B. W. Jackson (President), F. G. Vallee (Secretary), D. G. Huber, I. D. Spenser, and H. A. Wood. Their final report was submitted in June 1964. The summary follows:

The potential danger of any system of year-round operation is that it may serve to exacerbate the ills of the present system beyond hope and cure. Unless rigorous measures are taken, it seems likely that the tendency of the extended year would be to increase teaching loads and reduce time for research. The arrangement of term-length courses in a year of three or four terms would tend toward the further

fragmenting of the university's offerings, toward an increase in the number of lecture hours per day and week, toward unplanned, patchwork courses where students would pick up what was available in any given term. There would almost certainly have to be examinations at the end of each term, thus increasing the numbers and frequency of something that many consider to be at best a necessary evil. The shorter course time and more frequent examinations, besides increasing pressures on students and faculty, would militate against the process of assimilation and maturation that is held in some disciplines to be necessary to sound learning. There are also the dangers of faculty and student fatigue, and of interference with faculty time for refreshing themselves and their courses. Added to these things is the danger that the machinery of the university will come to dominate its academic life, and, finally, that both savings and increased capacity are doubtful at present.

This is not to say that these evils would necessarily follow upon the adoption of a system of year-round operation, but it is to suggest that, on the American experience so far, they would be a probable result of any year-round operation that was conceived simply as an extension of our present system, and put into operation merely to expand the capacity of our present universities at the lowest possible cost. On the other hand, it is possible that if some system were constructed with academic quality as its first consideration, the new system might serve not only to extend a university education to greater numbers, but also to improve that education itself.

If and when universities in Canada are faced with the need to consider year-round operation, it is likely that each to some extent will have to find its own salvation according to its circumstances and requirements. This committee does not feel that it can make specific recommendations. The report has already made some general recommendations, and implied others by what it has said about the results of the American experience in comparison with what the committee holds to be the aims and functions of a university. Certainly, any university considering a change should very carefully examine some of the systems tried in the United States and should consult the opinion of students, faculty at various ranks and in a wide variety; of departments, and administrators at different levels in various offices. Few of those we consulted felt they had found the right answer to their problem, and most were frank in admitting that they were groping toward it at considerable cost in time, money and energy. Since there is no reason to believe that our problems would be any easier to solve, or that, starting without the benefit of their experience, we would do the thing better than they have, it would be foolish not to try to benefit from that experience. Their aims and hopes, and the ways in which they have tried to implement year-round operation, are publicized in calendars, prospectuses and reports which may be obtained from the individual universities. This report has tried to concentrate on what appears to have happened as a result of their attempts. It represents information which for the most part has not hitherto been available in written form, although it may be had by corresponding with people in the Universities, or by visiting them. Where universities have set up committees to evaluate their systems to date, the committee reports, in so far as they are known to this Committee, are listed in the bibliography.

One final thing may be said by way of a general recommendation. It became apparent in the systems examined that frequently what suited Department A did not suit Department B, and that what Department B liked about the system was loathed by Department A.. Yet the system usually imposed unhappy conformity. Thus the best system would be that which allowed departments the maximum possible

freedom to do the things they had to do in the ways that were best suited to doing them. Some departments want more lectures, some want a fewer; some would like longer periods within the term for reading and research, others are not interested; some can use 75-minute lecturer periods, other find them impossible; some welcome the opportunity to accelerate students; others regard it with anxiety; some like a short, compact term, others prefer a long, loose one. These preferences are not whims, but professional opinions by men who know, in so far as such things can be known, what are the best conditions for instruction and for learning in their disciplines. To the extent that it is possible, any university system should attempt to accommodate the various requirements of its different departments, for to provide optimum conditions for instruction and learning for each one of them should be its first aim.

December 2, 1963: Campus Parking Issues reported by the Special Enquiries Committee

Professor McMullen reporting on parking for faculty and staff said that a special committee of which he is a member had met a number of times. He said that in the future it may become necessary to designate parking spaces and possibly introduce a charge. It was expected that parking facilities would be adequate until the academic year 1965.

During the discussion of the report, Professor Wardwell asked whether reserved parking would be effective at night. The reply was that after 6:00 p.m. policing was difficult.

Professor Wardwell thought that a case could be made for the provision of a number of parking spaces for evening work. Professor Bourns indicated that, including evening teachers, the number might be as high as 80. Professor McMullen agreed to report these points back to the Parking Committee.

December 2, 1963: McMaster Growth Fund Appeal to cover the “cost of buildings needed to provide adequate facilities in existing faculties over the next five years when enrolment is expected to double”.

Professor Lane reported to the meeting that Professors Lane, Grant and Robinson had, on invitation, attended a meeting of the McMaster Growth Fund on October 24, 1963. They were invited to discuss what role, if any, the Faculty Association should take in the Growth Fund Campaign. It was decided at that meeting that the matter should be brought before the Faculty Association.

During discussion some of the viewpoints expressed were that the Faculty members should contribute as private citizens rather than as a Faculty body. That there should not be any face to face campaigning by members of the Faculty. That a quota system used in an earlier campaign should not be used in future campaigns.

Concern was expressed about the distribution of finances. A responding view to this was that donations could be designated for use in a particular way. One suggestion was that Faculty Association funds be designated to a scholarship fund for students.

Finally it was *proposed* by Professor Bourns, *seconded* by Professor Kamin, “that the Association invites the executive to compose a letter indicating that the Association

gives full support to the McMaster Growth Fund Campaign, and that this letter be sent to all members of the Association.” After further discussion and general agreement that the Faculty Association should not become involved in the actual solicitation or collection of donations from its members, the motion was *carried*.

TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT

December 3, 1963: The Executive received a letter from a faculty member whose appointment as an Associate Professor without tenure had been terminated. “It was realized that the executive committee had no specific terms of reference on which to judge the case but that a positive yet informal role would be to make further investigation of the issues involved, in the hope that these issues could be more clearly defined.

December 11, 1963: J. E. L. Graham, who had been appointed to look into the termination of appointment, reported that discussions with members of the individual’s department disclosed that the decision to terminate “had been reached after extensive consideration”. One department member worried about “the possible recriminations which might arise due to the recommendation not to extend the appointment having been based on performance in class....the decision in the end was primarily based on judgement”.

December 17, 1963: The individual whose appointment had been terminated wrote to Dr. Graham that he had received written confirmation of an appointment at the University of Toronto and asked the association to close its inquiry regarding his termination. While his personal problems had been resolved satisfactorily, he offered his views regarding a general question of academic policy.

I suggest that it appears that the authority to deny permanency is at present quite arbitrary, that a member of the academic staff — especially one with considerable experience and published scholarship — should be considered worthy of permanency unless some specific and serious evidence can be presented to the contrary. I further suggest that the evaluation of such evidence, if it is put forward, should not be entrusted entirely to a few members of the department in question, aided only by the principal and dean. In particular I should question the fairness in giving a decisive vote in these matters to persons who are members of the same department as the probationer and who also are in quite a direct way rivals for future promotion along with the probationer.

December 18, 1963: The Executive agreed that the general issue raised by this case was one which concerned the Faculty Association.

April 27, 1964: The Special Enquiries Committee had prepared a first draft of a *Faculty Manual* (later to become the *Faculty Handbook*). Its structure is similar to the one followed in the current edition.

Robert W. Thompson

1964/1965

Summer grants had been given to the Sciences, but not to the Social Sciences and the Humanities. At the instigation of myself, as President of the Faculty Association, Dr. E. T. Salmon and I looked at the list of members of those two faculties and found that in a typical year approximately 1/3 of them would be ready to undertake appropriate research during the summer period. Dr. Salmon agreed to recommend that such grants be made available to faculty members in these two Faculties: these grants to continue to be made for as long as they were available in other Faculties.

When I became President of the Faculty Association, the Constitution of the Association provided that deans and other senior administrative officers should not be eligible for membership. Such a provision had not been provided in the constitution of some other university associations, with the result that such senior administrators were not excluded from executive positions. Consequently such officers tended to be elected to executive positions in those faculty associations. It was felt that these two roles might be in conflict, and so there was provision that such senior administrative officers could not be members of the Executive of the Faculty Association of McMaster. This provision was brought up for consideration, but it has remained in effect to the benefit of the University and the members of the Association.

It was felt that the members of the Association would benefit from the knowledge of future plans for the University. Dr. H. Thode as President of the University, outlined the plans, especially for the Medical Association. This clarified for the members what was proposed for the Medical Faculty.

Dr. A.J. Johnson presented a proposal for a programme in Science and Engineering. After some discussion of the proposal, and some recommendations from the Chairman of the Science Committee, the programme was adopted. It has been an important addition to the programmes offered by the University.

1965/1966

President: A. H. Black

September 1965: Letter from O. R. Morgan, Secretary, to members of the Association regarding Televising Lectures

You will probably recall that towards the end of last session it became known that the Extension Department wished to make use of the recordings of television lectures given in Psychology 1a6. It was later planned to show these lectures in Hamilton on the Channel 11 station during the present session. For a number of reasons, these plans have now been temporarily abandoned. You will appreciate that the possibility of showing lectures on television raises a number of issues, copyright, stipend, etc. In order to consider these issues more fully, a special committee of the Faculty Association has been formed, under the chairmanship of Dr. B. A. W. Jackson, of the Department of English. The whole question of television lectures is being considered on a national level by the C.A.U.T. It would therefore seem appropriate that if you are at all interested in the possibility of preparing lectures for television, you should contact Dr. Jackson, or any member of the Faculty Association Executive, who will be able to inform you of the various findings which have been made.²²

ESTABLISHING THE FACULTY CLUB

March 26, 1965: E. Comb's summary of a meeting with Dr. H. G. Thode and Mr. D. M. Hedden

...we discussed, with some degree of probability, using the present Alumni Building as a daytime faculty club, concentrating mainly on excellent luncheon facilities, lounges, and a bar (though the problems involved in getting a bar are immense and need further discussion). At some future point this facility would be turned over to the graduate students as a graduate centre in connection with Edwards Hall, to form a graduate students' complex. The Faculty would then move into a larger facility which would include extensive services for the evening meal and overnight accommodation. Because parking would be a problem, it seems most feasible to look for a place off this present campus for this larger facility....

September 8, 1965: Prof. Combs [Chair of the Special Enquiries Committee] reported that President Thode had given considerable attention to the question of a proposed Faculty Club, and expected his project to be approved by the Board of Governors at their meeting on September 28. He would be forming a President's Committee to elaborate his project. The committee of what is now known as the Faculty Club showed little interest in the project. Prof. Black hoped that the proposed club would eventually be administered by an elected

²²It was not until May 1967 that a report was released by the committee chaired by Dr. Jackson.

committee. Prof. Hunter thought this should be quite separate from the Association as such.

January 19, 1966: ...Professor Combs reported unrest among the Alumni with regard to the use of the Memorial Building, and announced that a vote of all alumni would soon be taken.

October 1965: Recommendations from the Salary Brief submitted to the Administration

It is clear...that the floor salaries should be raised. To bring the median university salary in line with other professions the McMaster University Faculty Association would recommend that the Board of Governors and Administration revise the floor salary levels for 1966-67 to:

Professor	\$14,500
Associate Professor	\$11,000
Assistant Professor	\$ 8,500
Lecturer	\$ 7,000

The implementation of this scale would help to place McMaster in a competitive situation and would forestall many of the impending difficulties. To obtain maximum benefit it is important that the new schedule of salaries be released prior to the recruiting of staff for the 1966-67 academic year, or in any event no later than the end of December, as is the practice in some other Ontario universities.

It is assumed by the Association that, as in the past, when adjustments have been made to floor salaries, all salaries will be adjusted by an amount at least corresponding to the increase in the floor salary for that range, and normal merit increases will not be affected.

At the AGM on April 13, 1966, K. L. Murphy, Chair of the Salaries Committee, reported that the new floors would be identical with those requested in 1964: Assistant, \$8000; Associate, \$10750; Professor, \$14000. The average increase "was roughly 13%, divided equally between floor increase and merit increase".

October 26, 1965: Administrative personnel with salaries of \$7,500 or more were entitled to free tuition. The Executive felt that this benefit should be extended to all University personnel.

January 1966: The Administration circulated a first draft of a new Pension Plan. On March 16, 1966, the Association contacted W. L. Mercer, Ltd. "to advise [the Association] of any pitfalls in the plan proposed by the Administration, of deficiencies in the plan compared with similar plans for other universities, and in general to provide us with data and advice in our negotiations. This could well include an alternative plan if you think this advisable" (letter from B. N. Brockhouse, Pension Chair, to R. Pease of Mercer's).

Jack S. Kirkaldy

1966/1967

Who Runs the University?

The malevolent Cold War incursions of US Senator Eugene McCarthy in the immediate post-war era not only dispatched academic refugees to Canada to our considerable benefit but the insidious philosophy also spilled over into this country to the permanent disgrace of certain government agencies. This set the stage for more than a decade of faculty activism in respect to academic freedom and tenure led by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). One measure of the success of their campaign lay in the ensuing ascendancy of one of its most highly respected leaders, Bora Laskin, to Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

By 1966 the focus upon academic freedom had shifted to university governance within academe, including decision-making concerning benefits, teaching and curricula. Although the McMaster Association as an associate of CAUT faced weightier problems during the 1966/67 year, a review of the negotiations for a comprehensive pension plan offers an interesting case-study and starting point for a discussion of decision-making in the academy. The leading members of the Pension Committee were Leo Kamin (Psychology), Bert Brockhouse (Physics) and Cal Potter (Accounting). The Ingraham Report of CAUT had established criteria whereby the existing Plan could be characterized as below a level described as “disgraceful”. Much effort was expended in later years to upgrade the pensions of retirees under this old Plan. To place the enterprise in the overall context of benefits: the established salary floors in 1966 were identical with those requested in 1964: Assistant — \$8000, Associate — \$10750 and Professor — \$14000. The average increase was roughly 13%, divided equally between floor increase and merit increase.

A draft Pension Plan had been circulated in January 1966, followed by intricate intensive negotiations leading up to the Association meeting of October 5, 1966. Kamin reported that the discussions with the Administration had been most reasonable and amicable. Notwithstanding, the committee put forward the following three motions which were carried:

1. The Faculty Association urgently requests the Board of Governors to reconsider the proposal for the establishment of a Pension Committee with faculty representation. We believe that in order to dispel possible misunderstandings on this question a face-to-face meeting between Association representatives and the Board’s Finance Committee would be of great value. We therefore request the Finance Committee of the Board to receive two representatives of the Association’s Pension Committee at its next meeting to discuss this proposal.
2. The Faculty Association recommends that in implementing a new Pension Plan care should be taken to ensure that no benefits previously accrued under the old Plan should be denied to any member. It is our understanding that the Administration’s interpretation of the new plan involves such a denial in the case of death benefits before retirement. Specifically, the existing Plan provides a death benefit of the member’s contribution plus the University’s contribution — the proposed new Plan provides a death benefit of the University’s contribution only. To compensate for this, an adjustment in the Group Life Insurance program is to be introduced coincident with the new Pension Plan. However, for members under the age of 59 the new insurance plan represents no

improvement, and the new Pension Plan under the Administration's interpretation would therefore deprive them entirely of benefits previously accrued under the old Plan. Further, for some members over the age of 59, the improved life insurance would not fully compensate for the loss in death benefit. We therefore urge that before implementation of the new Plan provision be made to guarantee that no member shall receive at the time of death a combined death benefit plus life insurance less than the sum of the death benefit previously accrued under the old Plan plus the life insurance that would have been in force under the now existing arrangements.

3. In the proposed new Pension Plan a substantial reduction of death benefits occurs. To compensate for this a modified group life insurance plan is to be adopted, providing that the insurance equal to three times salary be kept in force until the date of actual retirement. However, the Faculty Association understands that group life insurance plans typically incorporate an upper limit on the amount of insurance issued to any one member. We wish to record our view that the life insurance compensation for reduced death benefits is adequate only if care is taken to assure that the life insurance of all members is *actually* three times annual salary, and we urge that the University take steps to provide such assurance. We wish also to record our view that the new Plan should incorporate a statement indicating the role of group life insurance in compensating for the inadequate death benefits of the Pension Plan itself.

This action proved to be successful, for on November 8 Dr. Kamin was able to report that there was agreement to have a representative from the Faculty Association on the University pension committee, that death benefits will not be abrogated when the new plan comes into operation, the ceiling of \$75,000 for group life insurance will probably be removed or raised substantially, and that the 6% plan provides far better benefits than the 5% one.

Later, when the Plan was finally promulgated, I had the occasion to congratulate Cal Potter on the committee's success. He remarked that "it was a breeze, they're all in our Plan". During the ensuing years up to my own early retirement in 1989 I heard no criticism of the Plan in operation and certainly I have been pleasantly conscious of the adequacy of my income since then. However, my successors as chairmen may have reason to challenge that view.

The Plan has currently been in the academic news because of its large surplus over and above its liabilities and the negotiations under way to divide a surplus portion of \$150 million equally between Pension Plan members and the University. Our consultants in this action state that

The most recent financial statements of the Plan show that the market value of the assets as of March 31, 2001 is \$956 million. The Plan actuary estimates the liabilities of the Plan to be \$668 million at that date, resulting in a surplus of \$288 million at the end of March. In spite of a drop in the markets, the assets of the Plan have earned a positive rate of return from July 1, 2000 to March 31, 2001. This rate of return is not high enough to keep the total Plan surplus at the July 1, 2000 level of \$324 million but the University is advised that it is easily sufficient to allow the surplus distribution to proceed without any concerns about the financial health of the Plan.

Evidently, a degree of credit must be given to the fund managers. Our consultants remark that

The maintenance of a prudent diversified investment portfolio and the use of professional investment managers has allowed the Plan to enjoy excellent long term investment results without suffering short term drops in total asset values over the

past 15 Plan years, the average annual return on Plan assets is over 11% and, although there have been a few instances of market declines over that period, the Plan has achieved a positive rate of return in each Plan year. While this is no guarantee of future returns, it does demonstrate that the assets of the Plan are invested in a manner which offers some protection against short term declines in market indices.

The Pension Plan was only one of the issues of democratic governance which had captured the attention of all university occupants during the early post-war decades. McMaster had inherited a hybrid system, originally under the Baptist Convention of Ontario (see C. M. Johnston, *McMaster University 2, The Early Years in Hamilton, 1930-1957*). Science had expanded in the University as a wartime accommodation, with the nuclear research of H. G. Thode at the forefront, and to allow federal and provincial funding Hamilton College had been created with its own Board of Governors, the rest being subsumed by “University College”, with Principals in charge of each entity, but with overlapping Faculties, and Deans and Heads of Departments on unlimited terms. A so-called University Council with strong faculty representation had been assembled in an attempt to effect a University-wide coordination, which I presume ought to have been the function of an effective Senate.

In 1957, the year of my employ, McMaster severed its ties with the Baptist Convention, becoming a public University with a mandate to **grow**, which it did with enthusiasm in the 1960s under the presidency of H. G. Thode. He had the vision of creating a Cal Tech in Canada’s industrial heartland. Thode was single-minded to a fault, but comprehending the importance of recruiting and retaining competent faculty, his position was seldom at odds with the Association objectives (see recent biography).

Following resolution of most of the promotion and tenure issues under the aegis of CAUT and the rapid addition of predominantly younger faculty, a strong interest in academic democracy emerged which naturally clashed with an existing somewhat anomalous structure and aging hierarchy, a situation evidently ripe for change. The Chairman of the University Government Committee, Goldie French (History), reported to the Association on *ad hoc* progress to April of 1966 with the writing of terms of reference for chairmen and the faculty involvement in the formation of committees to appoint a new Librarian and Registrar. The University Council was planning to appoint a committee to consider reforms with participation of the Governors, Senate and faculty. Hopefully the Association would be able to name two representatives to the committee. The Executive had prepared a slate of members competent to serve and proposed elections based upon this slate.

By June the Senate had assumed its prerogative in this matter and agreed to the appointment of a joint Senate-Board University Council committee on University government. In the meantime it formed an *ad hoc* committee to recommend the terms of reference and composition of the final committee. At the end of July the President invited the Board to participate in both committees, but in September it was learned that it had declined the invitation. The Senate instructed that the joint committee’s mandate should include the academic, administrative and governmental structure of the University; for example, questions on the role of Principals and the need for an academic vice-president. A report on terms of reference and composition was scheduled for November 1966, with reporting to extend over 1967, firstly on the relationship between Board and Senate, with a final report at the end of the year.

The *ad hoc* committee specified the composition of the Senate committee as:

President, *ex officio*
Chairman, faculty, not a member of administration, appointed by the President
5 Senate representatives
2 University Council representatives
1 Faculty Association representative
Possibly a student representative

This composition was accepted by the Senate and University Council in September. The committee was then constituted as follows:

The President, *ex officio*
Chairman: Professor Kirkaldy, appointed by the President
Senate: Mr. Kent (Alumni), Mr. Brown (Alumni), Dr. Kamin (Faculty),
Principal Petch (Administration), Mr. Hedden (Administration)
University Council: Dr. Jackson, Dr. Litvak
Faculty Association: Dr. French
(An undergraduate and a graduate student member were later added)

The Board had so far decided not to collaborate with the Joint Committee, but was planning to have a committee of its own on University government. It was hoped that collaboration between the two committees would be possible at a later date. The Faculty Association Executive decided at the time that it would make no public expression of regret at the Board's decision not to collaborate, at least until more positive and conciliatory approaches had been attempted.

At first sight one might conclude from the composition that the Faculty Association had conducted a successful *coup*. Alternatively, it might have been concluded that Thode, Petch and Hedden were the masters of co-optation. Actually, there was no conspiracy. There was just a common realization that there was a problem to be solved by concerned and competent persons. All of this civilized bureaucratic juggling was being played out against a backdrop of isolated cabals and personal animosities up to the extreme of vandalism stemming from ideological differences, of deep sorrow concerning the (planned?) decline in the influence of the Faculty of Theology (not the least of the slights residing in the creation of a Department of Religion under the chairmanship of the philosopher, George Grant), the strongly perceived adverse effects of the proposed on-campus location of the medical school and an 11-story teaching hospital, and dissatisfaction with the power and inertia vested in the permanent tenure of Department Heads and Deans.

It may appear from the foregoing that our deliberations were strictly a local matter. By 1966, after a decade of economic expansion, strongly influenced by the auto pact, there were now something like a baker's dozen universities in Ontario (very few with endowments) and a number of new community colleges, all with heavy charges on the public coffers. Accordingly, the heat was on the Department of Universities and Colleges and its granting agency, the University Affairs Committee (UAC) to prove accountability in the system. Various federations of supplicants had sprung into being, including the Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario (COPSUO), the subsidiary Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (read Deans), the Ontario Council (soon to be Confederation) of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) whose adversary positions paralleled those within the individual universities. In December 1966, the Spinks Commission, reporting to UAC and COPSUO, brought down its report recommending the creation of a University of Ontario following the California model. Brough McPherson of OCUFA responded with a scathing critique of an approving *Globe and Mail* editorial. OCUFA followed through with the following message to its affiliates:

“Since the Spinks Report has now been released for public discussion, it is imperative that Faculty Associations study it and express their views singly to their administrations and jointly with OCUFA. The fact that the Committee of Presidents and their Council of Graduate Studies has reacted to it and acted upon it in advance of publication and without consultation with faculty emphasizes the urgency of our consideration. You will find enclosed an early commentary by Professors McPherson (1965 Chairman) and Kirkaldy (1966,67 member of OCUFA executive and 1968 chairman). The latter is preparing a more lengthy commentary which will be circulated shortly (documents on file at MUFA).

Following the motion made earlier, the executive is calling a meeting for February 24th and 25th to fully air this matter. We suggest that each local undertake vigorous discussion and research in the local context immediately so that they may report in full to the OCUFA assembly. We suggest that they prepare themselves to contribute to discussion of:

- (a) A University of Ontario
- (b) The proposed Provincial Research Library at Toronto
- (c) The proposed provincial accreditation scheme for graduate degrees (see below). As we understand it, this Ph.D. scheme has been brought into force without prior faculty consultation.
- (d) Assuming that some sort of “accreditation” scheme is inevitable, how should it be organized and under what authority should it operate?
- (e) Graduate studies in the new universities.

We suggest that Presidents, Boards, M.P.’s, Librarians, Deans of Graduate Studies and Chairmen of Departments should be interviewed concerning these matters insofar as this may be possible in the limited time available.

This meeting will be held at the Sydney Smith Building, University of Toronto, with sessions beginning at 1:30 p.m. February 24th and at 9:30 a.m. February 25th.

With my ingrained sense of sympathy for the underdog, I was incensed at the implication that the new universities — Trent, Laurentian, Brock and Lakehead — if not externally disciplined, would fail to act as responsibly as the established ones had in developing graduate programmes. I was further incensed by the unpredictability of repression and dangers of constraint on the creative undertakings which had been communicated to me, and also by the bureaucratic conception, sophistry and self-interest of the academic establishment residing in Part III of the prospectus of the Committee of Accreditation to follow:

- “1. 1. There shall be a standing committee of the Graduate Council to be known as the Committee of Accreditation.
- 2.(a) The Accreditation Committee shall consist of six members of the Council on Graduate Studies of which four will constitute a quorum.
- (b) Except in the first instance when the terms of office will be two for one year, two for two years and two for three years,

the term of office on the Committee shall be at least two members²³ from Toronto, Western Ontario, Queen's, and McMaster, and at least two from Ottawa, Waterloo, Windsor, Carleton, Guelph, and York.²⁴

3. The members of the Committee shall be elected in accordance with whatever voting procedure the Council adopts and will be eligible for re-election.
4. The Committee shall elect its own chairman annually and he shall be eligible for re-election.
5. The chairman shall have a deliberative vote but not a casting vote.

II. The functions of the Committee shall be

- (a) To evaluate and appraise graduate programmes in any discipline at the request of the university concerned or of the *Ontario University Affairs Committee* or of the *Ontario Council on Graduate Studies* (my emphasis), and in every case with the consent of the university.
- (b) To report on its appraisals as detailed in part III of this By-Law.”

The reverberations of the February meeting of OCUFA and its affiliates, the strident criticism of the graduate appraisals plan and particularly the way the scheme was instituted, led to the announcement of an impending meeting between the representatives of OCUFA and the Committee of Presidents, an arrangement which ultimately assumed a statutory basis. As a consequence of these confrontations and ensuing developments the OCUFA Council and Executive decided that a permanent secretariat must be established with a full time executive vice-chairman as a consequence of which affiliates would have to increase their contribution from \$1 to \$13 per annum.

For McMaster this meant that our fee would have to go up to an average of \$30 per member per year. The Executive prepared an item for the annual meeting on April 24, 1967 suggesting that the fee schedule should be related to rank on an estimated basis of \$18 for lecturers, \$24 for assistants, \$36 for associates and \$48 for full professors. That particular meeting was a watershed for the Association for its existing constitution made it impossible to deal with the weighty matters which had accumulated during the year. As a consequence, all of the motions had to be tabled and the

²³The members of the Accreditation Committee are the universities; the Nominating Committee, in consultation with the graduate dean, may nominate a non-decanal faculty member. However, continuity is important, and each individual nominated will be expected to serve throughout his university's term.

²⁴ The Spinks' Commission Report categorizes the first named group of universities as having “fully-developed honours and graduate programmes, to Ph.D. level in many fields” and the second group as having “Honors and graduate programs launched and Ph.D work in some fields.” In the future, the Council may find it desirable to amend this by-law if one or more universities change categories. (A comparison with the recent evaluations published by McLean's magazine may give an idea of the inertia of the system being built in at this time).

meeting aborted. Prior to the reconvened annual meeting on May 10, 1967 the chairman circulated the following explanation and plea:

Dear Colleague:

This second spring meeting is being called because of constitutional difficulties which prevented the completion of the business of the April 27th meeting. For the information of those not present, the minutes of that meeting follow. They deserve careful study.

This Association is not alone in being trapped by a constitution formulated in an era which was quantitatively and qualitatively different than the present. In particular, the specification of the regular quorum at 1/3 of membership and the quorum for constitutional change at 1/2 of membership was not unreasonable at a time when the membership was less than 100 persons. With growth of the university, the dispersal and increased tenor of activities and the decay of personal communications and a sense of involvement, the percentage attendance at meetings has continuously dwindled. Indeed to this observer the absolute attendance has remained approximately stationary during a period in which the membership has tripled. While past and present Executives must accept a responsibility for failure to undertake the reform of the Association with vigour, they have in the meantime performed their duties with devotion and always in adherence to democratic principles. Indeed, as the minutes indicate, it was adherence to these general principles which has in part led us to the present difficulties.

In the coming meeting, the Executive proposes to first introduce an amendment to the constitution which will reduce the quorum from the present 1/3 of membership to the fixed number of 50 persons. Ordinary motions will require a 50% majority while constitutional motions will require a 2/3 majority. We must then proceed to the elections for 1967-68 according to the slate appended. Following that we will reintroduce the proposal for a change in the constitution concerning the membership rules (see minutes of previous meeting). Finally we propose to ask for authorization from the membership to institute the graduated fee structure proposed below.

As the Executive's use of the constitution has been challenged it is essential that the membership make an effort to attend this meeting. We should be thankful to those who have focussed critical attention on our constitutional weaknesses, for change is long overdue.

J. S. Kirkaldy
Chairman

A three-hour meeting was held on May 10 with a record 108 members present and all the essential business was completed including the election of a slate for 1967/68, as usual carefully balanced over the various academic components, the ranks and the sexes.

The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the foregoing record can be credited to the secretary Lynn McDonald (Sociology), who was already under consideration for chairmanship of the Association but who elected to leave McMaster for other career opportunities which proved to include a period as a Member of Parliament from 1982 to 1988 for the NDP.

As epilogue: the report of the Joint Committee ultimately had a reasonably positive reception in Senate which adopted a structure which has proved to be stable over the years. There was a period of rather acrimonious negotiation with a small Board committee involving Kirkaldy, with Vice President Bourns acting for the Senate (Bourns succeeding Principal Petch, who one might say was a victim of the reorganization). Both the Senate and the Board became more representative and responsive, with faculty influence much enhanced in both cases. The Board retained its prerogative of appointing the President, but only upon nominations from the Senate.

At the end I would like to report two items from the record of the 1966/67 Special Enquiries Committee of the Association which indicated clearly that there was one area of interest on which there was complete consensus across the University community. Eugene Combs (Religion) reported that Alumni approval for use of the Memorial Hall as a Faculty Club was overwhelming. Harry Turner (History) was able to report later that a recent meeting of the Board agreed to provide outside services to the Alumni building, to back the \$50,000 loan which will be necessary for renovating the building and to allow the Club to apply for a permanent liquor licence.

1967/1968

President: G. S. French

December 11, 1967: The Salary Committee agreed to study the relation of women's salaries with men's salaries.

February 8, 1968: In response to a letter from President Thode inviting the Faculty Association to name representatives to sit on the new University Centre Committee, Dr. French nominated B. A. W. Jackson and J. E. L. Graham as faculty representatives. "We would prefer, however, that they be considered as members of faculty in whom we have confidence rather than as formal representatives of the Association." This Committee was being struck in response to a submission by the McMaster Students' Union that a University Centre be established. Since the MSU recommended that the Centre be a University-wide facility, the President's Council suggested that an expanded Committee be composed of representatives from all interested constituencies..

April 29, 1968: Report of the Salary Committee

The floors for 1968/69 will be:

Professor	\$15,600	an increase of \$500
Associate	\$12,000	
Assistant	\$ 9,500	
Lecturer	\$ 7,500	

"The average increase for continuing faculty will be 12%, entirely calculated on a merit basis."

April 29, 1968: The following resolutions regarding Pensions was passed at the General Meeting.

This Association views with grave concern the fact that a whole year has elapsed since the unanimous passing of our resolution concerning the inadequate pensions currently paid to certain retired professors, and that we have as yet no assurance that any remedial action will be taken. We strongly beseech the University to recognize the urgency of this matter and to correct the continuing disgraceful situation without further delay. [This motion was circulated to all members of the Board of Governors as well as to the Administration.]

This Association considers the existing pension plan to be unsatisfactory in several respects. It is inadequate, inequitable, and falls far short in its major provisions of plans currently in effect at other Ontario Universities. We accordingly insist that the understanding reached when the plan was adopted in 1966, that it would be completely reviewed in time for revision after three years, now result in immediate and meaningful discussion and negotiation between the Administration and the Association so that a satisfactory plan will be ready for implementation not later than July 1st 1969.

This Association lends its support to O.C.U.F.A. in its investigation of the desirability and practicability of instituting a unified pension plan for all Ontario Universities. Such investigation, however, in no way lessens the need or the urgency of revising our own plan within the coming year, and optimism over the eventual outcome of O.C.U.F.A.'s study must not be permitted to prejudice the negotiation of such revision.

That this Association insists on the immediate provision of a statement of accrued benefits on the pension plan as obligated by Article 11 and that such statement be provided promptly.

Throughout the year, the Special Enquiries Committee, chaired by H. E. Turner, negotiated with the Administration on the development of a *Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure*.

INTERESTING NOTE:

Jack Kirkaldy was elected President of OCUFA

B. W. Jackson

1968/1969

In retrospect, unaided by minutes or notes or diaries, the 1968-69 academic year, after nearly a third of a century, appears, from the point of view of the then President of the Faculty Association, as a blur of activity: meetings, confrontations, motions, arguments, discussions, plans, stratagems, proposals, counter-proposals, initiatives, good intentions, labours and, occasionally, achievements.

It is this last item that gives the writer pause. About all the others he can be airily certain, for they are the common impedimenta of a Faculty Association Executive Committee's year, but for actual achievements, one must consult the record, and the record introduces reality. Many of the schemes sputtered out. Many of the plans came to nought. Many a stratagem failed. Much labour was spent in vain. Such is the truth of the story told by the minutes, faithfully kept at the time by the secretary, Maureen Halsall, and later kindly supplied to the writer by the Faculty Association Office from its archives. Though much was undertaken, not so much was accomplished. Yet, even where the minutes suggest that little had been achieved, we can see now, from the perspective of the year 2001, that beginnings had been made, or progress had followed the initiative of earlier Executives, in matters that would come to full achievement under later Executive Committees. Perhaps that is the way things always are with such organizations. At any rate, here, according to the minutes of the Association, is the record for the year 1968-1969 of the last century.

Under an impetus provided by David Winch, the Association demanded a review of the University's pension arrangements. Citing the woefully inadequate pensions paid to those already retired, and the general inadequacies of the Pension Plan as a whole which suggested that there would be no improvement in the pensions of future retirees, the Association urged that immediate relief be provided for those already retired, and asked the University to consider seriously a revised Pension Plan provided by the Association.

As a result some relief was provided for those already retired, and the Pension Plan put forward became, over the years, the basis for the pension arrangements now in place.

At one point, in order to stimulate action on pensions of those already retired, David Winch suggested that, at the time of the United Appeal, the Faculty Association circulate its own appeal on behalf of the retirees to raise an amount sufficient to bring their individual monthly pensions even to a modest minimum of \$400, and that we make a public announcement that our individual donations to the United Appeal would be reduced by the amounts required to reach that objective.

There was also at the time considerable interest in a common pension plan for the Universities of Ontario, to be arranged through OCUFA. McMaster was sympathetic, but over the years no such plan has been developed.

Throughout its term of office, this Executive, with strong support from the Association in general, continually pressed for a larger share in the administration of the University, particularly in financial decisions as these affected salaries, pensions, promotions, tenure and sabbatical leave. In late 1968 the threat of a strike by Local 532 of the Building Services Employees Union produced a situation where the Faculty Association, sympathetic to the Union's position and demands, was brought into direct confrontation with the University administration. A note from the minutes of December 16, 1968 reads in part: "Dr. Jackson was charged to convey to President Thode...the Faculty Association's concern that the University has not reached a satisfactory settlement and is thereby endangering the undisturbed pursuit of studies on the part of students and faculty alike, both by

inviting a disruptive strike and by fostering bad labour relations which, along with uncompetitive wages, can only lead to the hiring of the least competent people available on the labour market. In connection with this discussion, such questions were raised as the following: What is the total wage bill at McMaster as a percentage of the total current expenses? Since faculty salaries are low and service employee's wages have been described as shameful in comparison to those at other universities in the province, whereas government assistance to all these institutions is based on the same rate, where does McMaster income go? For instance, what percentage of the wage-bill goes to proliferating administrative personnel? *All these questions underlined the need, stressed in our salaries brief, for a meaningful faculty involvement with the details of University budgeting*". (my italics)

In general this Executive Committee's position reflected the faculty's dissatisfaction with an Administration whose attitude failed to recognize that the harmonious functioning and public reputation of their University is a matter of intimate concern to faculty.

The Executive throughout its term of office continued to exert pressure on the Administration in various areas where finances and governance were concerned. Pensions have already been mentioned. In salary matters, the Executive pressed for accurate information as to how the government grant to McMaster was divided between administrative salaries, faculty salaries, and other expenditures, employed briefs from its Salary Committee to query the position taken in these matters by the Administration, and to press for greater faculty participation in the decisions about the expenditure of the government's annual grant. A small step forward was marked by a letter from a member of the Board of Governors which expressed interest in the point, made in our salary brief, that the faculty *should have knowledge of University finances* (my italics), and which also recognized another point we had made: that there was surely an anomaly in a situation where a faculty includes various experts (e.g. economists) of a stature where outside institutions hire them as special consultants while their advice is unavailable to their university, or unsought by it.

On Promotion and Tenure, the Administration was urged by the Association's brief to attempt at least to keep abreast of what are seen as the more enlightened practices of other Canadian universities. This would involve making lecturers eligible for tenure, making three years the normal time from appointment to consideration, allowing a candidate the right to appear before his Tenure and Promotion Committee, having the Tenure and Promotion committee elected rather than appointed, making all faculty from the rank of associate professor up eligible to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committees. Our brief also recommended that the structure of the committee be such as to recognize that it is not to be seen as a battleground between two opposing forces (Faculty and Administration) and should try to prevent such a view by including as a full voting member of every Tenure and Promotion Committee the Chairman of the candidate's Department who would serve as both an administrator closely in touch with the candidate, and as a colleague thoroughly aware of the candidate's teaching and scholarship.

During these various discussions and confrontations between Faculty and Administration, the Faculty Association was aware that at some other Canadian Universities there were factions in favour of forming a faculty union with a view to strengthening their position **against** the Administration by acquiring the bargaining power and the potential for collective action that unionization would provide. Our Association at the time showed little interest in the union idea, and considerable opposition to it, preferring to construct, if possible, a situation where Faculty and Administration would work together for what might be assumed to be their common interest — the welfare of McMaster.

The foreseen confrontation was an ongoing struggle of the universities with government for more generous funding. There was a desire to cooperate with OCUFA of whose activities Jack Kirkaldy kept us well informed. There was suspicion of, and little enthusiasm for, the proposed University of Ontario with its likelihood of centralized government, and the multiplication of administrative

offices in an expanded bureaucracy.

A minute from the General Meeting of the Association on December 12, 1968 reveals some of the matters under discussion in a period when increased government grants to the universities were accompanied by increased government interest, and sometimes interference, in their activities: "Dr. Vichert reported on the study of the relations between university and government being made with the joint support of the A.A.U.C., C.A.U.T., C.U.S. and E.G.E.Q., assisted by a Ford grant. Subjects for investigation are defined as including: the role of the university in a changing society, university autonomy, government control of the university, instruments for establishing and maintaining relations between university and government. McMaster's contribution to this study is a *report on the effects of formula financing particularly with respect to departmental budgets*" (my italics). For us, practical examination; for others, theoretical speculation.

Apart from these time-consuming matters, the Executive came to grips (or attempted to) with such items as the formation, in cooperation with the Administration, of a Traffic and Parking Committee, the problem of increasing the membership in the Association (an 'opt-out' policy was considered on a suggestion from OCUFA), forming a committee to make representation to the Administration on the problem of the disparity between male and female salaries, the formation of an Ethics Committee (without a very clear mandate), establishing a book-rack and bulletin board in the Faculty Club for the presentation of Faculty Association material. The Executive also discussed possible ways of assisting the Czech students on campus with money and language instruction.

The Special Enquiries Committee reported no progress on the question of student rights and student participation; in view of the action being taken on this matter in other quarters, it was decided that the Association need take none at the moment.

The President of the Association was asked to inquire into the status of the "long-heralded" Faculty Handbook. His report, if made, has not been recorded.

The secretary was instructed to inform former Faculty Association members, now retired, of their eligibility for honorary membership.

The problem of the frictions that have developed between the University and faculty members renting university houses was consigned to a sub-committee for the Special Enquiries Committee.

An attempt to obtain a Faculty Association charge-plate for use at the Book Store and Printing Shop was foiled, but the Association did succeed in acquiring its own notepaper with letterhead!

So not all was lost, and, indeed, as I was writing this report, it came to me that, along with gaining our own notepaper, we did make appreciable headway in what turned out to be the main thrust of our activities: the winning of a more significant role for faculty in the operation of McMaster University.

1969/1970

President: D. W. Carment

June 25, 1969: University President, H. G. Thode, announces to the McMaster Community that the Board of Governors has authorized improvements to the Contributory Pension Plan, effective July 1, 1969. At the MUFA General Meeting on November 26, 1969, Dr. D. Winch announced that this new Pension Plan had achieved parity with the University of Toronto.

October 1969: Recommendations from the Salary Brief submitted to the Administration

- (1) A comprehensive salary policy be established for academic staff which insures:
 - (a) maintenance of purchasing power in each succeeding year of service;
 - (b) increments in purchasing power in each succeeding year of service equivalent to the increase in productivity in Ontario;
 - (c) merit increases for faculty members whose service to the University is meritorious;
 - (d) salary equivalence with other leading Ontario universities.
- (2) The formation of a committee with representation from the Faculty Association to formalize a system of merit determination.
- (3) Disclosure of information about the financial operations of the University to all members of Faculty.
- (4) An increase in stipends for credit and non-credit courses in Extension to achieve parity with the University of Toronto including the restructuring of stipend payments to provide differentials between the ranks.
- (5) Completion of salary policy discussions with the Faculty Association by December 15, 1969 and at least preliminary statements regarding salary increments for 1970-71 by January 31, 1970.

The April 1970 volume of *The Reporter*, MUFA's newsletter at the time, reports on some of the key issues which were addressed during 1969/70. Selected articles are reproduced in their entirety below:

STATUTORY SABBATICAL LEAVES

McMaster University has never recognized sabbatical leaves as a statutory right of the Professorate. Indeed, there is a document on "leaves-of-absence" predating Harry Thode's presidency which says in effect that there is no such right.

During recent years the practice has arisen whereby a faculty member may with permission take a half years' leave-of-absence with full pay or a full years' leave with half pay after each six years of full-time service. There is no cumulative clause. With some important exceptions, the award of leave is being made on an equitable basis in the various divisions of the university.

The Administration is understandably reluctant to promulgate a liberal sabbatical policy, for if all faculty were to take sabbaticals regularly more faculty might be needed. The present system is accepted because only about 3% of faculty are on leave at any one time. About half of these are on the half-pay schedule and half on the full-pay schedule. This small percentage is a reaction to the financial sacrifice which most faculty members must make in order to take a sabbatical leave and the extra expenses and dislocation of teaching activities and family life which necessarily attend such a move. There is also the reluctance of many professors to impose on their colleagues, for substitute teaching is not always provided. From Trent University, where the sabbatical policy calls for leave after six years at full pay, we have heard that no substitute teaching is being provided, resulting in extreme pressure on the faculty to forgo their statutory right.

As we intimated above, there are certain inequities in the present "ad hoc" arrangement for sabbaticals. At least three departments have in the past awarded "internal" sabbaticals at full pay to individual professors to allow for intensive scholarly work. Junior professor A in the Division of Science and Engineering has been on internal and external leave for two years continuously through partial subsidy from outside, while senior professor B in the Division of Arts has been refused a one year sabbatical at full pay after 14 continuous years of service.

These and other inequities focus attention on the regressive character of our present arrangements. Leaves-of-absence are primarily rewards for scholarly success, subsidizing those who have already made the grade and discriminating against those teachers who are most in need of a quiet period of study and contemplation.

SIT-INS

As offensive as the idea is to many academics, the "sit-in" has through precedent become a legitimate form of social action and protest on the campus. It has also proved to a growing number of students that it is a much more effective procedure for promoting administrative and faculty action than is token representation on the committees and boards of the university.

The "sit-in" at the President's office by the Committee of 75 between April 3rd and 6th, ostensibly provoked by inadequacies in the food services, gave this reporter [J. S. Kirkaldy] an opportunity to observe closely the anatomy of this social phenomenon and to become well-informed in anticipation of a possible mediation role for the Faculty Association.

Although I went to the "sit-in" Friday evening in a state of considerable anger, I must admit that I was charmed by the idealism and compassion of most of the participants and the fine sense of community and cooperative power which suffused the group. At this point the power and leadership of the McMaster Student Movement (MSM) caucus was not strongly in evidence. This became apparent, however, at the marathon meeting in the foyer of Gilmour Hall on the afternoon of April 6th, which

responded to the statement that Dr. Bourns read to it at 1:00 p.m. That meeting was masterfully orchestrated by the caucus, leading to further difficult demands upon the administrative group, and effectively politicizing a substantial number of previously uncommitted student observers. It was clear, however, that for each concession from the administration group the more moderate among the students, who wished to end the sit-in, gained a notch in strength over the numerically weak caucus. It was therefore Dr. Bourns' final conciliatory gestures late in the afternoon of April 6th which assured the consensus which ended the "sit-in".

Although the parallel deliberations of the administrative group were carried out in camera there was sufficient leakage to infer that there was a vigorous conflict between the "doves" and the "hawks", the latter pressing for an early "bust". Fortunately the moderates, including the Acting President, held sway and the confrontation was dissipated with a minimal number of muddied faces on either side. In the opinion of this observer, Dr. Bourns showed exactly the right balance between firmness and flexibility for effectively dealing with this complex problem. Indeed, Ken Stone, one of the Committee of 75 spokesmen, grudgingly conceded this at the Monday afternoon meeting.

The choice of food services as an issue was of course tactical. This area was identified because it is an administrative responsibility and the Administration is compact and vulnerable, and because both commuter and residential students can easily identify with the ever present inadequacies. The real issue of quality and relevance of university education is being thus far passed over by our student critics because the problems are ill-defined and the Faculty as antagonist is diffuse. This may not always be the case.

OPT-OUT SYSTEM

The President of the Faculty Association has just received word from Mr. Hedden, Vice-President (Administration) that there is no administrative barrier to the initiation of an "opt-out" system of membership in the Faculty Association. Notice of motion on this matter was given at the fall general meeting for decision at the coming spring meeting (April 30). Following is the text of Bill Carment's letter to Mr. Hedden on this matter. This should serve as a basis for debate at the Association meeting.

March 26, 1970

Dear Mr. Hedden:

The Faculty Association of McMaster University has a long history of concern and positive action in all phases of University life. As a professional organization, affiliated with the Canadian Association of University Teachers at the federal level, and the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations at the provincial level, it represents the voice of the faculty-at-large to the university community, and through its affiliations, to provincial and federal organizations. As the university becomes larger, adequate communication among the various segments of the university becomes increasingly difficult. The association provides, with a present membership of over 80% of the non-medical faculty, an important forum for the dissemination of decisions and opinions, as well as open discussion of current and recurrent issues. It is evident that for these and other functions to be adequately maintained, a large membership is required.

As the faculty increases in size and becomes geographically dispersed, it becomes

difficult and time-consuming for the Association Executive to contact faculty in solicitation of their membership. An “opt-out” system of membership would help remedy this difficulty without imposing a system of undesirable characteristics. That this approach is both feasible and worthwhile is evidenced by the experience of other universities in the province where “opt-out” is successfully in operation. These include Carleton, Toronto, Waterloo, Western, York, Guelph, Laurentian, and Lakehead.

The “opt-out” system should not be confused with a system of compulsory and automatic membership and fee deduction (as is the case with student union fees). No one is obligated to join the association, everyone is informed of the process, and all have an opportunity to decline membership.

The “opt-out” procedure is straightforward. Upon its institution all new appointments and those not currently members would be informed of the inauguration of the system and given the opportunity to opt-out through circulation of an explanatory letter. Current members of the association would not require this separate circulation since they would have been kept up to date through the Association’s Newsletter and general meetings. In subsequent years only new faculty would need to be informed, and it is suggested that this could be done through the President’s letter of appointment. To assist new appointees in making an intelligent decision, a brochure describing the role and activities of the Association would be included with the President’s letter. Our legal advisor indicates that this is a correct and legal procedure.

In view of the many advantages of the “opt-out system”, the Faculty Association requests that the University agree to institute it beginning July 1, 1970.

If you require any additional information, I will be happy to supply it.

MEDICAL FACULTY AND THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

We have in earlier issues [of the newsletter] expressed our concern about the lack of interest of medical faculty in the activities and aims of the Faculty Association. We are now beginning to detect some manifestations of the resulting isolation. It has been learned for example that medical faculty are being hired on an 11 month contract, the summer stipend being absorbed into the annual salary. We may expect this to be used as a precedent in future negotiations with the administration on the status and value of the stipends in other divisions. We have also gained the impression that the Health Sciences administration is not very keen about tenure guarantees, and some of the junior faculty are worried about it. Finally, it is apparent that the Health Sciences administration is the most autocratic in the University. For example, the salary committee consists of one person, the Dean!

While we appreciate the fact that most of the medical faculty are more independent financially than others and that most of them spend less time on campus, it seems reasonable to insist that they accept their full responsibilities as members of the university faculty.

Norman Shrive

1970/1971

A review of the minutes of the meetings of the Faculty Association during the academic year 1970/71 would indicate that it was hardly a year of controversy and stirring events.

I began my year as President of the Association by sending a letter to all new members of faculty informing them that they, as participants in the “Op-Out” system, were automatically members of the Association and would remain so unless they chose otherwise by November 1, 1970. The system was a subject of at least mild discussion all year, but in the final analysis did result in increased membership (over 80%).

The Association also attempted to improve the conditions related to Sabbatical Leave, particularly requesting that a full-year sabbatical would carry a 75% salary. “The board of governors did not adopt the new plan even in principle, but referred it to the board’s finance committee” (Minutes of the MUFA Annual General Meeting, May 4, 1971, item 3).

Notification of salary increases was received much earlier than usual, but the Association’s request for 14% was denied and faculty had to be satisfied with 8%. Even this amount was regarded as excessive by Dr. [Martin] Johns, who feared that increasing salaries would prejudice the hiring of necessary new faculty.

A foreshadowing of future subjects of concern was the information to the members that the Senate was making significant changes to the University Tenure document, changes that indicated tenure would be much more difficult to obtain in the future. Also, at the final meeting of the year a motion was carried unanimously that “the Faculty Association, cognizant of the need...for participation in the decision-making processes of the university in the financial area, instructs the executive (1) to investigate all possible methods of obtaining information from the Administration regarding its financial operations as a prerequisite to getting some involvement in the decision-making process and (2) to report the results back to the next general meeting” (Minutes of the MUFA Annual General Meeting, May 4, 1971, item 4).

I relinquished the Presidency and was succeeded by Dr. Rosenblood.

Norman Rosenblood

1971/1972

Perhaps the best way to focus on the role of the Faculty Association during the years 1971/72 is to let the recorded “Minutes” of the Faculty Association Executive’s deliberations speak for themselves; and then I shall try to recall some of the contexts and personalities that shaped and imparted life to those events. Before I do recall those times, let me say, with gratitude, that I was particularly fortunate to have been a member of a Faculty Association Executive whose members brought with them not only a wealth of experience but also a great deal of colour, seriousness and dedication. How can I forget the fiery zeal of Jack Kirkaldy, the Churchillian wit of David Winch, the incisive clarity of Bill Carment, the fine analytic approach of Gerry King, the stabilizing influence of Norm Shrive (the immediate Past-President) and the insatiable quest for justice of Mark Levinson. Not for one moment did I, a callow youth in their midst, ever experience any feelings of resentment, manipulation or superiority on their part. All of them had years of Faculty Association experience that far exceeded mine and I believe they used it with good will and no little humour to further the positive role of the Faculty Association in contributing to McMaster’s welfare.

The following is a quote from the Executive Minutes of June 2, 1971:

It was decided that Drs. Rosenblood and Hunter arrange a meeting with President Harry Thode to discuss the possibility of future consultation of the Association with the Administration on budgetary and other issues, with the view to closer active co-operation between the two bodies on these matters.

Accordingly, a letter from the Executive was sent to Dr. Thode expressing those sentiments. A few days later I received a call from Dr. Thode’s secretary, Sadie, requesting my presence in Dr. Thode’s office “immediately”. When I was seated in his office, a few moments later, without exchanging any pleasantries, he quietly, but firmly, asked me, gesturing to the Faculty Association Executive’s letter on the table in front of us, “what do you want?” I replied that I was merely a conduit of the Executive and what it wanted was to be represented on the University’s budgetary committee, an office of its own and the opportunity to be informed of any major policy decisions affecting the University. He then asked “why?”. I cited the recent notice of the University’s intention to include extension teaching in the teaching loads of faculty members and that there was some concern about the implications of workloads for the teaching faculty members, and more importantly that the Faculty had not been consulted and that it was perturbed at this exclusionary act by the Administration. I also indicated that the Executive was concerned with the allocation of funds to various faculties, and the implications that some departments might experience hardship *vis à vis* hiring and planning programmes if they did not have the opportunity to contribute information to these deliberations. President Thode said that he would think about the request. We then cordially said goodbye.

On Thursday, September 30, 1971 the “Minutes” record the results of a meeting with Dr. Thode and Mr. Hedden concerning these matters:

Since the proposed meeting, during which the Association President and Dr. King received some hope of progress, nothing had been heard. Dr. King pointed out that it appears that Administration/Association relationships at McMaster are the worst in Ontario, and that the President (Dr. Thode) of the University should be made aware of this state. The possibility of CAUT action was also raised.... It was proposed that: A letter be sent to Dr. Thode inviting him and his advisors to a

meeting of the Association Executive. If no reply was received after seven days, then a registered letter should be sent.

The result of the first letter was a meeting with Mike Hedden, the Vice-President of Administration, and the Executive in which an agreement was reached to allow two faculty representatives to participate in the budget deliberations of McMaster. The Administration also agreed to provide a brand new Faculty Association office fully furnished on the fifth floor of Chester New Hall; the Administration also accepted David Winch as the Faculty Association's representative on the Overload Committee. Winch's contribution resulted in a system that allowed faculty to "bank" credits by teaching summer and night school courses. These credits would be applied to future requests for sabbatical leave.

As I look back at my relationship with Dr. Thode, I have several recollections. As far as giving the Faculty Association the power that it requested, I don't believe he endorsed the idea enthusiastically at all. One always had the feeling that to deal with political matters was not to his liking; the simpler things were, the easier they could be attended to and disposed of. From his experience in the Senate as its Chairman he well knew the way academics can bog down in pedantic hairsplitting and mean and petty jealousies that often result in worthwhile programmes and innovative projects being discussed to death. He had an inscrutable and determined air that could lend itself to various interpretations; nevertheless, I also believe he was a shy and humane man. When the Executive of the Faculty Association held a luncheon, in the West Room of the still standing Faculty Club in The Alumni Building, to honour his retirement, he accepted a gift of an expensive painting with a brief and plain thanks. There was no trace of bonhomie or humour. When I had occasion to speak to him, at a later time, on the growing governmental plans to limit foreign students from studying at Canadian universities, he grew somewhat intense as he narrated how, as a young farm boy in Saskatchewan, he had told his father that the University of Chicago had offered him a scholarship with no reference to his being a foreigner and how grateful he as a Canadian was to the Americans for not erecting quotas and barriers to scholarship. He ardently hoped that Canada would not place restrictions on students from foreign shores.

Another important area of progress, in 1972, was the settling of the Graduate Student Association's strike. After numerous exchanges of unproductive communications between the Administration and the Graduate Student Association's leaders the graduate teaching assistants felt there was no alternative but to cease carrying out their duties unless the Ontario government rescinded its intention to raise graduate students' fees. The Faculty Association openly intervened in this state of affairs by requesting a meeting with the Administration — Dr. Arthur Bourns who had succeeded Dr. Thode to the Presidency of the University, Dr. Alvin Lee the Dean of Graduate Studies — and the President of the Graduate Student's Association. At that meeting, in President Bourns's office, the graduate students were adamant in their demand for no increase of fees and felt that McMaster could easily remedy the problem. The Faculty Association representatives — Drs. King, Kirkaldy and Rosenblood — suggested that all the parties to the dispute meet with the Ontario government's Minister of University Affairs, the Honourable George Kerr (a man who was later to gain additional fame and dubious lustre by swimming in Burlington Bay when he was Minister of the Environment).

The Faculty Association's proposal was passionately objected to by the Administration on the grounds that it would jeopardize McMaster's practise of quickly investing its grant money from the government in short term money markets. Dr. Kirkaldy, with eyes flashing and beard bristling, responded to this view by exclaiming that "if a man's underwear was clean he shouldn't be reluctant to show it in public." This profoundly incisive and graphic image appeared to compel those assembled to agree to go to Queen's Park and meet with the Minister, Mr. Kerr MPP. A meeting thus took place a few days later in the Minister's spacious office in Toronto with the delegation from McMaster University. The meeting was characterized by the Minister's unabated outpouring of torrents of dismal statistics and monetary woes that made it impossible, in his opinion, to offer any assistance at that time. He did, however, promise, in all sincerity, to do all he possibly could to

alleviate the hardships that he knew the universities of Ontario were experiencing. The effect of the meeting was to illustrate clearly that the graduate students were targeting the wrong institution; in fact, the Graduate Students Association President, who showed visible signs of depression while sitting in the Minister's office, had it borne in upon him, and seemed to indicate that after experiencing the relentless rhetoric of Queen's Park, the graduate students, rather than picketing the University, should be expressing sympathy for it. Within a day or two following the meeting in Toronto the Graduate Students Association decided to end its strike.

The Faculty Association Executive "Minutes" of 1972 has the following recorded item which speaks for itself:

Dr. Rosenblood introduced the members of the newly formed Committee on the Status of Women (Professors Dorothy Pringle, Myrtle Kutschke and Edith Wightman) who outlined the terms of reference and plans of the Committee. Negotiations to form such a committee began in July, 1971, following a request from the Canadian Association of University Teachers. The first meeting of the Committee had taken place in September to decide the terms of reference and policy. It was realised that there exists an ignorance about the status of women members of Faculty at McMaster. There appeared to be no overt discrimination against women, but it was pointed out that there are only 62 women members of Faculty on campus, 19 of whom are in Nursing and 10 of whom are in Physical Education. A system of interviews has been established covering all women Faculty members to ascertain their feelings about possible discrimination on campus."

Professors Pringle, Kutschke and Wightman had an eager and dedicated air about them. It was always a pleasant experience to discuss their positions and one could not help but be impressed by their careful and studied approach to a problem that took far too many years to solve. I always had a particularly strong respect and liking for Edith Wightman, a History professor, who had a soft and gentle quality that somewhat belied her keen analytical mind and her salty wit. Unfortunately, and to the University's sorrow and loss, she met a tragic and untimely death a few years later.

The year 1971/72 also saw several other incidents and problems that the Faculty Association Executive had to deal with: the Wright Report which many faculty saw as threatening the erosion of the historic role of the University. Professor Tom Truman of blessed memory (I can still see his florid cheeks and hear his Aussie accent) and I went down to Toronto to address the Commission which was hearing briefs from Ontario's universities. One phrase that Tom, standing tall and undaunted at the microphone, used to attack the Commission's aims still echoes: "a pernicious and creeping form of Populism". Fortunately, the Wright Report faded into the murky dusk of the Queen's Park archives.

I also recall the letter from John Evans, Dean of the newly structured Medical School, asking the Association to advertise their clinical services in the Faculty Association Bulletin. I attended a meeting with Dr. Evans and Dr. Epstein in which we offered to advertise their services if they (the Medical School) would ask their faculty to join the Faculty Association. Alas, Evans and Epstein shied away from such an arrangement and the deal was not consummated; nevertheless, the Executive passed a motion "that Dr. Epstein be invited to write something for the Newsletter indicating the extent of the services offered at the Medical Centre" (October 13, 1971). I also recall some lingering acrimony over the destruction of the beautiful Royal Botanical Gardens on University Avenue as a site for the new McMaster Hospital; some members of the University community believed the Hospital would have served its purpose just as well if it had been built in the vast wastelands of the parking lots on the western side of Cootes Drive.

Mark Levinson, the Chairman of Special Enquiries, on January 28, 1972

brought two cases to the attention of the Executive. The first concerned the memorandum to be mailed under the name of the Association President, Dr. N. Rosenblood, concerning the complaint of alleged discrimination practised by the Hamilton Country Club. The second case concerned promotion and tenure. The advice of Dr. Donald Savage of CAUT was being sought in the second case.

The Hamilton Country Club issue was based upon the University's use of those premises for a University function.

Finally, a fairly long excerpt from the "Minutes" of 1972:

The proposed University Centre. Dr. Ferns, the Association's representative on the Committee discussing the Centre, outlined the deliberations of the Committee thus far. Assurance had been given that there would be no expansion north of Hamilton Hall, although there was the possibility of an eastward expansion.... The full cost is estimated at about \$1,300,000.... It was also noted that if the project was approved and implemented it would mean the ruin of one of the best academic buildings on campus. It was pointed out that little consultation with involved groups had taken place. It was proposed by Professor Hunter, seconded by Professor Hobbs, that Mr. Heaven and Mr. Hedden be invited to a meeting of the Executive in the near future to discuss the project (January 28, 1972).

As I reread the references to the University Centre, with their words of caution, I feel a regret, not only that the promise to avoid demolishing architectural and natural beauty was forgotten or ignored, but also that the Executive did not put in place a standing Committee to be party to ALL discussions about any changes that the Administration planned to the geographical appearance of McMaster's campus. One wonders how many more of Mac's beautiful lawns and trees will be lost before it becomes evident that a second campus is required so that what still remains on the original campus may be preserved.

From this vantage point of some thirty years, one may draw a few conclusions from participation in The Faculty Association's Executive in 1971/72. Apart from the memorable and dedicated people one associated and worked with at that time, one also recalls the concept of "collegiality" that the faculty struggled to both honour and promote. It appeared that the concept was perpetually on the brink of disappearing or at least being ignored by the Administration and that the Faculty Association was the only force that prevented its demise. It would seem that the quality of collegiality is dependant upon the values and integrity of those who administer a university's faculty and also upon the vigilance and vitality of those who represent the faculty's rights to be treated fairly and justly. Perhaps it is McMaster's fate to be perpetually in a state of tension between these two states, thereby managing to avoid the hard realities that come with a formal unionization of faculty? Such a delicate balance can be easily lost.

In the year 2000 the Faculty Association Newsletter carried a warning to faculty members contemplating a written contract with the Administration for early retirement. The caveat noted that any binding contracts with the present Administration should first be reviewed by a lawyer before they are signed. This warning arose from the experience of a faculty member who learned that if an agreement signed prior to retiring is not honoured by the Administration after retirement, he cannot use the University's grievance procedures to remedy the grievance because the Grievance Procedures do not apply to retirees; thus the faculty member would be forced into the costly position of retaining his own legal counsel. This flagrantly unfair policy, that bears little resemblance to the concept of collegiality, points out clearly the invaluable importance that the

Faculty Association still has some fifty years after its inception. It is my sincere wish, therefore, that future Faculty Association Executives will be moved by loyalty to their constituents and the courage to guard and to ensure their rights in all future relations with the academic and financial Administration of McMaster University.

My sincere thanks to Professor T. R. Hobbs, the Secretary of the 1971/72 McMaster Faculty Association, for his meticulous recording of the “Minutes” during that term of office. I also wish to thank many members of the Faculty Association, whose names do not appear in this brief recollection, for their service during those years.

Arthur Bourns

President Emeritus (Professor of Chemistry Emeritus)

1972-1980

It is difficult for me to realize that fifty years have passed since I attended the first meeting to plan the formation of an Association to represent the interests of the faculty of the University, which seemed an almost revolutionary idea at the time. Some of McMaster's outstanding scholars and future academic leaders were present: Togo Salmon, Craig McIvor, Arthur Patrick, Roy Wiles and Martin Johns to mention but a few. Strange as it may seem, I was asked to serve as Chairman of the Salary and Pensions Committee a few years later. I suspect that it would be an exaggeration to say that the faculty's excellent salary structure in the years that followed can be attributed to this appointment.

The strong involvement of the University's finest scholars has been a characteristic of the Association throughout its history. It is for this reason that the welfare of the University as a whole, not only of its faculty members, has been foremost in the minds of the Association's leaders. It has been my very good fortune to have been associated with such exceptional academics during my years in university administration. While there were times when we may have disagreed on certain issues, we never differed in our goals, to help in any way we could to make the University one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the Country.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I extend to the McMaster University Faculty Association my warmest felicitations on the occasion of its Golden Anniversary. May the achievements of the first fifty years serve as a foundation for many more years of outstanding service to our University.

1972/73 - 1973/74

1972/1973

W. D. G. Hunter, President

May 24, 1972: Letter from W. D. G. Hunter to Myrtle Kutschke, Chair of the Association's newly formed Committee on the Status of Women

...There is no doubt that we have a clear obligation to protect women faculty against discriminatory treatment in salaries. If your Committee, on the basis of its findings, makes recommendations for eliminating inequities in the salaries paid to women academics as a group, I will urge the Executive to consider incorporating these proposals in the salary brief to the President and Board and to press for corrective action....

Dr. Kutschke's Committee reported in April 1973 with the following recommendations:

1. On the basis of the study "An Investigation of the Determinants of Academic Salaries of Full-time Faculty at McMaster University", the Committee recommends that:
 - (a) Salary levels of women faculty members be reviewed in an attempt to isolate such inequities as may exist. Particular attention should be paid to the salaries of the rather small number of women faculty members over the age of, say 40, (allowing for difference in mean ages of men and women) and those in the Faculty of Medicine.
 - (b) The Faculty Association request the University to make adjustments in the salary levels of women faculty members who have more than, say, five years of service, if a review of further evidence and an investigation of particular circumstances do not substantially reverse the conclusions drawn in the report.
2. On the basis of the study of part-time faculty, the Committee recommends that:
 - (a) The Faculty Association request the University to direct itself toward the elimination of such practices as show discrimination toward women holding part-time appointments, when such part-time rather than full-time appointments are the result of certain anti-nepotism policies currently practiced by Senate within this University.
 - (b) That the faculty Association urge the University to investigate the nature of part-time appointments in general. There would seem to be much room for improvement in such areas as conditions of appointment, definition of responsibilities and privileges and research facilities. That part-time Faculty members be allowed some representation in the Faculty Association.
 - (c) The Committee wishes to proceed with its questionnaire in a modified and shortened form in order to obtain information to answer the following questions:
 - a) Do Faculty members with equal qualifications and experience differ in

terms of tenure, rate of promotion and division of duties in ways which can be explained by a difference in sex?

- b) If such differences exist, are they accounted for by:
- i difference in treatment between men and women on the part of the university?
 - ii differences in attitude between men and women to their careers.

May 31, 1972: Professor Hunter reported that the Presidential Search Committee had replied to his letter asking for Faculty Association participation in the activities of the Search Committee. "The committee secretary...replied that because of the high degree of secrecy being maintained, the committee could not entertain the involvement of the Faculty Association in informal discussions."

November 8, 1972: Letter from Dr. Hunter to President Bourns regarding the Load Teaching Document which was approved by Senate on September 13, 1972.

There is a great deal of concern across the campus respecting the way in which the load teaching policy is being interpreted and applied unilaterally by the Administration. A number of faculty members have protested about this to me, both by telephone and by letter, and have urged me to take up the matter with you and endeavour to have it put right.

A principal ground for the complaints is the practice, newly introduced, of specifying load teaching obligations for those existing faculty who are being granted tenure or who are receiving extensions of non-tenured appointments beyond one year.

It is apparent that the costs to the University, in terms of loss of confidence in the equity of the procedure and of possible external repercussions, are likely to exceed the benefits that might arise from it. I should, therefore, like to request that load teaching provisions be removed from contracts being offered to those who are already members of our academic staff; and that individual faculty members, through their departments, be asked to assume load commitments on a voluntary basis.

November 23, 1972: In a letter to Vice-President (Administration) Hedden, Dr. Hunter reported the Executive's recommendation that the "pensions guaranteed to retired faculty members be increased by 50%".

November 27, 1972: 140 faculty attended a Special Meeting to express their dissatisfaction with the Administration's proposal to terminate the summer research stipend. In a letter from Dr. Bourns to the Association of October 3, 1972, he explained one of the reasons for discontinuing the stipend. "Research is only one of the ways in which faculty can contribute to the work of the University during the summer months. It, therefore, seems unfair to give an extra award only to those who devote this period almost exclusively to this activity." He concluded that "we have now reached the point where the contributions of our faculty in research, whether in the summer period or during the academic year, can be recognized most effectively through their regular salaries".

There was strong feeling against the unilateral decisions of the Administration on terminating the summer research stipend and on interpreting the guidelines in the load teaching document. It was also manifest that there was considerable uncertainty and anxiety in the faculty at large because of the present circumstances of financial stringency and retrenchment. This was combined with a lack of suggestions for alternative policies beyond urgings to the Executive to adopt more aggressive attitudes towards the Administration. Despite the extreme dissatisfaction there was no strong support for a proposal that the Faculty Association withdraw from existing joint committees.

The Faculty Association representatives on the Joint Committee On Pushing Out The Summer Research Stipend Programme were instructed to obtain a clarification of the terms of reference of the committee.

There was a notice of motion for the General Meeting in December:

That this meeting instruct the executive to inform the President that we are deeply disappointed with the unilateral decision the Administration has made in relation to summer stipends and letters on reappointment, and that these questions be reopened together with academic staffing formula and load teaching.

Subsequently the Association named D. M. Shaw, W. J. Slater, and A. A. Kubursi as its representatives on the Joint Presidential/Faculty Association Committee.

December 14, 1972: The Executive reported to the membership that it had agreed to participate in the establishment of four joint committees:

(i) **Tenure for Part-time Faculty**

Terms of Reference: "The Committee will be charged with the responsibility of studying and making recommendations on whether tenure should be provided for part-time faculty members and, if so, on the circumstances and criteria involved."

The proposal originated in Senate on May 8, 1972 as a recommendation of the Subcommittee on Equal Rights for Women in Faculty and Administrative Positions at McMaster.

(ii) **Faculty Assuming Public Office**

Terms of Reference: "To formulate a policy and establish guidelines under which faculty members may seek public office and serve, if elected."

The Committee has been formed in response to requests for clarification of the current policy.

(iii) **Phasing-out the Summer Research Stipend Programme**

The future of the scheme was raised last year by President Thode, and examined in September by President Bourns and his Executive Committee without consultation with the Faculty Association. President Bourns decided that the scheme should be terminated with a suitable phasing-out period and the funds released for faculty salaries. The proposed joint committee was to work out procedures for the phasing-out of the programme on an equitable and practical basis.

Professor Purnell read the letter of October 3 in which President Bourns offered

reasons for his decision.

On October 19 the Executive voted to nominate three people to this joint committee. Subsequently, the nominees, Drs. Shaw, Slater and Kubursi, and Professor Hunter decided to send a memo to faculty soliciting opinions and suggestions. Over two hundred replies were received. At the Special Meeting held on November 29, Dr. Shaw was instructed to inform the Joint Committee of the division among the faculty, with the result that the Committee was placed in a state of suspended animation. Dr. Shaw informed Mr. Zack of the situation in a letter on December 1. Since then the Executive has met with President Bourns and his Executive and a new proposal has been made.

Professor Hunter pointed out that a notice of motion had been circulated on this question so he deferred discussion of the matter to later in the meeting.

(iv) **Committee on Academic Staffing**

The idea of setting up a Committee on Academic Staffing was mentioned by President Bourns in Senate on October 11. The text of the President's statement appeared in *Contact* on October 20. He formally invited the participation of the Faculty Association on such a Committee in a letter on October 18.

The proposal was examined and approved unanimously by the Executive on October 19. The chairmanship was offered to Dr. Kirkaldy.

At a meeting of President Bourns, Dr. Kirkaldy and Professor Hunter, the terms of reference were examined in detail and clarified. Tentative arrangements for secretarial help were made with Mr. Zack.

The target-date for representation of the Committee's report was set for mid-March in time for presentation to the Annual Meeting in mid-April. Both Executives have agreed that it is essential to have a new policy based on agreed recommendations ready for application in 1974/75.

For the information of the Association, Professor Hunter outlined briefly the procedure implied in the use of joint committees. A fairly new device, they have been employed for the production of the tenure document and for the load teaching document. The reports of the joint committees must be submitted to the Administration, to the Association's Executive, and to a General Meeting of the Association where members can debate and vote on the recommendations. Written statements to this effect have been received. No policy can go forward unless and until the Association has approved it. If Senate wishes to make changes of substance, the document in question must be returned to the Association for approval or rejection. One difficulty is still unresolved however. Assuming a document is accepted by Senate and the Board, and becomes University policy, it is conceivable that the Administration may interpret the document in a way not contemplated by the Association.

In response to Dr. Bishop, Professor Hunter explained that he and President Bourns had agreed that Mr. Zack should be non-voting Chairman of three of the joint Committees as Mr. Zack has had considerable experience in this connection.

December 14, 1972: Committee on Academic Affairs is established.

Motion:

That the Faculty Association Executive appoint a Committee on Academic Affairs to make a preliminary report at the 1973 Spring general meeting. The subjects which this Committee should study include the following:

- 1) Ways to bring together in meaningful dialogue the intellectual resources dispersed within the University – in areas of research, teaching, and intellectual concerns.
- 2) Ways to make the intellectual resources of the University more available to the community at large.
- 3) Ways to direct the training of Graduate Students toward their teaching function.
- 4) Examination of the Association's role in expressing concern regarding persecution of academics for their ideas, both in Canada and abroad.

The motion was carried.

December 14, 1972: The salary brief called for a 13.4% increase (4.7% cost-of-living, 4% merit/progress, and 3.7% of GNP increase). The brief was described as "having a firm tone".

Subsequently, the following settlement was made: ATB, 3.5%; Average Merit Increase, 3.5%.

April 18, 1973: The President's Report at the AGM is reproduced below in its entirety.

The Association through its executive and its committees has had an extremely busy and productive session. We have been involved in a greater number of areas of endeavour than ever before. One obvious reason is the less favourable environment in which the universities of the province are now operating; this change has brought many new problems and challenges for the Association.

A second reason is that we have a new president of the university who naturally wishes to alter established practices to some extent.

Finally, the President and Administration have over the years come to appreciate the value of the support and co-operation of the Faculty Association; the result is that our aid and advice are being sought over a whole range of matters that only a short while ago were never referred to us at all.

This increased involvement has obviously added to the burden of work coming to the President of the Association, to the Executive, and to the various committees on which our members serve. At present we have 10 internal committees with a combined membership of 37 people. We have 6 representatives on external committees and 12 representatives on joint committees. This means that 60 individuals are serving the Association.

There have been 12 regular Executive meetings and one special meeting in the course of the year, and one joint meeting with Dr. Bourns and his executive at which we discussed

staffing, the research stipend, and university financing.

The members of the executive have been an energetic and conscientious group who deserve our thanks for having taken their responsibilities so seriously. The presidency of the Association has become a very time-consuming office. Fortunately Mrs. B.M. Lamb was able to act as secretary; Professor Hunter expressed appreciation of her help, and thanked Dr. Winch for his co-operation.

Foreign Graduate Students and Employment Opportunities

A letter was sent to the Minister of Manpower & Immigration supporting the appeal of graduate students concerning the denial of work permits. It is understood that the government has decided to relax the restriction.

Cost Study

President Bourns asked the Association for its co-operation in carrying out this study, and the Executive's support was given after the scope and intent of the exercise had been clarified.

Select Committee on Economic and Cultural Nationalism

A letter was sent to the secretary of the senate expressing our objection to: "the decision of Senate on March 14, 1973 authorizing the President of the University to release confidential data on individual faculty members, without their consent, to a body, namely, the Secretariat of COU, whose position with respect to the privacy of the information is not protected by law." President Bourns in responding informed Senate that all universities are providing this information to COU, and assured Senate that the data on individuals would be returned to McMaster before more detail could be demanded by the committee.

Cragg Case

A letter was sent to the Secretary of Senate objecting to the decision to award an honorary degree to Dr. L.H. Cragg, President of Mount Allison University on the grounds that both the President and the Board of Regents of that university are under the most severe form of CAUT censure; and requesting that implementation of the decision be delayed until such time as the censure has been lifted.

A motion to reconsider the decision received majority support at a subsequent meeting of Senate, but failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

A further letter was sent to President Bourns by Professor Hunter requesting him: "to take the necessary steps to ensure that the citation accompanying Dr. Cragg's presentation at Convocation and any press release in connection with the award, will omit all reference to the fact that he is the President of Mount Allison University and concentrate on his purely academic contribution as a teacher and as a scholar."

Three Items Pending for New Executive

1. **Data Security.** President Bourns has asked the Association to nominate three members to a proposed presidential task force on data security.
2. The Association has been asked by President Bourns to give an opinion on whether the University should participate in the Salary Survey on University Teachers by the Public Service Staff Relations Board.
3. A request from President Bourns to concur in a proposal to amend the document,

Appointment, Tenure and Promotion, with respect to the special appointments held by some members of the Faculty of Medicine, is still under consideration.

INTERESTING NOTE:

1972/73 was the first full year in which the Association was provided office space. Arts I (Chester New Hall) 411-412 were set aside for the Association. The Administration provided a desk, conference table, chairs, shelves and a filing cabinet. The total cost, including redecorating of the rooms, was estimated to be \$1,400, to be covered by the Administration.

1973/1974
G. W. King, President

July 20, 1973: Special MDs

It was brought to the attention of the Executive that there were a number of special appointments being made in the Medical Faculty, which were being financed from funds outside the university, and which were in effect only as long as funds remained available. After discussion it was agreed that Prof. King and Prof. Truman meet with the President of the University and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine to discuss (i) how many persons are involved, (ii) the source and the administration of the funds involved, (iii) the duration and levels of appointment, (iv) the question of promotions, (v) the relationship of such persons to the regular faculty.

September 21, 1973: Following a meeting with the Dean of Medicine, F. Mustard, regarding special MDs, Dr. G. King reported that he was working on the wording for "Continuing Appointments without Annual Review" (CAWAR) and would be submitting it to the Association's Tenure Committee, "making clear at the same time that such appointments are anticipated only in Health Sciences and only where the funding is totally outside the control of the University".

March 1974: The Status of Women Committee issued its report, "An Investigation of the Determinants of Academic Salaries of Full-Time Faculty at McMaster University" with the following recommendations:

1. That each chairman examines the salary of each faculty member in his department. Where a male and female member have similar qualifications, he recommends the award of equal salaries or justifies to the Dean a difference in salary favouring either the male or female member in terms of contribution to the department.
2. That the Faculty Association strongly urge administration to go beyond proposed salary increases in order to remove salary differences which cannot be justified.

April 24, 1974: The President's Report at the AGM is reproduced below in its entirety.

This past year has seen increasing involvement of the Faculty Association in the affairs of the University at all levels, as well as increased interaction with both the Federal and Provincial Governments through C.A.U.T. and O.C.U.F.A. Our opinions are sought on matters ranging from Federal-Provincial tax sharing to the cost of French Fries in the cafeteria; from the value of the Basic Income Unit, to where the bus stops should be placed on campus. In between these extremes, there are such matters as Salaries, Pensions and Tenure with which we are very actively concerned. There are some twenty-five committees which have a total of over fifty representatives of the Faculty Association serving on them. This represents a huge voluntary investment of time and effort on the part of many of our members, and I would like at this point to thank them all for their services. Much of the work of the Association goes on behind closed doors, and it is often just the end results which are seen publicly.

Highlights of the Past Year

I should like briefly to review the highlights of the past year; or lowlights, from some points of view.

The year started with the **Cragg affair** last May. This was the proposal to award an Honorary degree to the President of Mount Allison, a University under censure by the C.A.U.T. Senate got itself into a box over this one, and did not rescind the invitation to Dr. Cragg, even after Faculty Association pressure. However, a compromise was reached by which Cragg was formally awarded his Honorary degree for his academic accomplishments and *not* for his record as an administrator. The affair received widespread publicity in the press both here and in the Maritimes, and disseminated to the public the fact that Mount Allison is under censure, and the reasons for this.

We were next involved in a hassle with Senate over reserving a seat for a **student Senator on the Senate Committee on Appointments**, which considers promotions and tenure. We disapproved of this proposal, mainly for three reasons. These were as follows. Firstly, Faculty being considered for Tenure or Promotion deserve the best possible evaluation of *all* aspects of their academic work, and students do not have the proficiency to assess this. Secondly, the Senate Committee has access to the confidential files of Faculty members, and frank evaluations by external or internal referees become more difficult with students on the Committee. Thirdly, there is the conflict of interest problem; a professor would possibly have to examine and grade a student who in turn is evaluating the professor for tenure or promotion. I might add that the C.A.U.T. is currently seeking legal opinion on this last question; the legal waters are rather murky, but I gather that there could be grounds for lawsuits on either side; by the Professor if he was turned down by the Committee, or by the student if he felt that his getting low course marks was connected with this. Altogether, the situation is one which it would be highly preferable to avoid.

Anyway, we circulated a Brief on these lines to the membership, who approved it by three-and-a half to one. This Brief was then submitted to Senate. There are no students on the Committee this year, but the matter will doubtless arise again next Fall.

Next, there was the extended struggle with Dr. Bourns over the **Summer Research Stipend Issue**, which is also on today's agenda. This started with a statement by Bourns that he intended to drop the Stipend and incorporate the money into regular salary. The FAIR Committee, a Joint Presidential/Faculty Association Committee, was set up to examine the matter, but our membership did not approve its recommendations for one reason or another. Last January, Bourns then proposed phasing out the Stipend in two stages, over

two years. The Association still felt, however, that if the Stipend money were incorporated into regular salary, then it would be “lost” in the shuffle over the next few years. Bourns is now prepared to consider alternative uses for the money, separate from salary, and this is what we will be debating later.

There are many other items which I will not go into at present. These include modifying the **Load Teaching** document to give greater equality to Faculty; **Tenure for Part-time Faculty**; the **Salary** negotiations; **Academic Staffing** problems, the possibility of an **early retirement scheme** and **indexing Pensions** to the cost of living.

The most recent major event was, of course, the unfortunate mess that developed out of the **French section affair**. I personally feel that similar troubles may well surface next year in different forms; but at the moment we have a pause in which emotions have cooled, and we should take this opportunity to see what lessons can be learned from the crisis. This is why the matter is on the agenda later on this morning. In this Report, I shall briefly summarize what happened in relation to the Faculty Association. We were involved quite considerably, but only on an informal basis. I kept our profile low because I simply was not going to play the game the way that some students wanted it, that is, by engaging in the politics of confrontation. On the other hand, I attended almost all the various meetings and activities, heavily disguised as a student, and indeed actually sat-in in Gilmour Hall for a short while. I did not, however, manage to get arrested.

Back on February 12th, I wrote to Dr. Bourns urging him to hold an impartial enquiry into the problems of the Romance Languages Department, in order to release the pressures that were building up. Subsequently, I met with Dr. Bourns and Dean Berland to discuss ways of easing the situation. At that time, the problems were confined to within the Department, and did not seem impossible to solve. Then the French students formed a union, went on strike and sat-in in offices, and everything escalated. Meanwhile, on March 7th, Dr. Bourns appointed Dr. Mueller, of Surgery, as a mediator in the dispute. This was done in accordance with the mediation Procedures established by Senate, which in no way called for Faculty Association participation. However Dr. Mueller consulted with members of our Executive, and agreed to accept Denis Shaw in the role of Faculty Association observer, with access to all the files. This conforms to the practice recommended in the C.A.U.T. Guidelines.

There were two main issues in the dispute. The first had to do with the rehiring of personnel in the Department. We have membership throughout Romance Languages, and we remained scrupulously neutral on personnel and personality questions. This way, we did not prejudice any possible appeals to our Special Enquiries Committee, which deals with grievances. However the personnel question was regrettably pursued instead in a glare of publicity, under the worse possible conditions for negotiation. Our Special Enquiries Committee was available, but was not invoked.

The second issue was the restructuring of the Department and its Committees. We had a chance to see Dr. Mueller’s preliminary proposals for this and to make comments. Our comments were in line with the Brief to Senate which had already been approved by the membership. We opposed students sitting on the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, and opposed parity for students on the other Committees, but agreed to student *participation* in these. Students should have ready means of input into all Departmental Committees. In Dr. Mueller’s published report, he did recommend parity for students on three interim committees; a minority for students on the Search and Selection Committee; and no students upon the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

After the arrest of some students by the police, matters escalated further and culminated in the open Senate meeting in the Gymnasium on March 28th. I did not feel that this meeting would serve any useful purposes, other than relieving some of the pressures and allowing a great deal of student opinion to be voiced. This is indeed what happened. The Faculty Association is not in an adversary position to the students. But whatever we might have said at the open meeting, I am sure that the activist students would have cast us in an adversary role. The meeting would have become Faculty versus the students, with Senate refereeing the fight. This would have been a highly damaging posture for us, and so we did not openly participate.

I wish to mention one other matter. The office of President of the Faculty Association has now become almost a full time job. In addition, it requires a great deal of **secretarial assistance**. Much of the work is fairly low level stuff; answering enquiries, preparing surveys, organizing printing and distribution of materials, and so on. I would like to suggest that the time has now come when the Faculty Association should engage a permanent Executive assistant on a part-time basis. Otherwise, I am afraid, there will be considerable reluctance in future years for people to accept the post of President. The ideal sort of person would be a mature person with some executive experience, who can also handle the typing and other secretarial duties. We currently have total assets of only \$10,000. If the Association should wish to hire an assistant, and also keep a healthy bank balance, then I would have to recommend that the Annual Dues be raised from a quarter of one percent to three-eighths of one percent. This extra one-eighth percent would, of course, be more than people would pay because dues are tax deductible.

In conclusion, I wish to thank in particular the members of the past year's Executive for their advice and support. I feel that we all worked together exceptionally well, and I am grateful for this.

We are entering a period in which the relative roles of Faculty, Students and Administration in the University are having to undergo major changes and readjustments. We must be prepared to accept this upheaval of our traditions, both individually and collectively. The change will not be an easy one and stresses and strains will come to the surface, both internally and in our relations to society. Recently, we have been hearing on all sides loud cries about student rights and faculty duties. Let us now redress the balance towards faculty rights and student duties.

Frank E. Jones

1974/1975

Cutbacks in university funding were the order of the day in the 1970s. The comparative richness of government spending on higher education in the 60's, summed up by the phrase, "tooling up" that allowed a wealth of new appointments to accommodate the expected influx of "baby boomers" was over. Among the consequences was the possibility of tenured faculty firings as well as the adoption of contractual appointments. Important changes in the relations of faculty in Ontario's universities to their administrations began to occur during the Seventies. While the severe cutbacks proposed for government funding were the underlying cause for change, the nature of these changes was shaped by both university administration and faculty responses to the cutbacks. In my May 1975 report to members, I said that in contrast to other years when the Administration was the source of our difficulties, in 1974/75, "our greatest threat [came] from the Government of Ontario" which prescribed, as measures to reduce the need for funds, retrenchment in terms of larger classes, higher student-teacher ratios, curriculum revision to eliminate low-enrolment classes and faculty layoffs. McMaster's was among those administrations and faculty associations arguing for a government funding basis that went beyond student enrolments to recognize other important requirements of university education, such as courses whose subject matter allowed only small enrolments, the necessity of research facilities, and so on. Within the University, we urged the creation of joint Administration and Faculty committees to find solutions for a variety of problems. In my report, I suggested that the crises facing the University had led to increased communication between the Administration and MUFA and changes in the relations between the Association and the Administration. Our objectives and actions derived from an unwavering commitment to the principle of collegiality. The specific issues included MUFA's participation in appointments, promotions and tenure policy, and in budgetary decisions, including presentations to the Ontario government. For this memoir, I have chosen to describe and comment on the principal changes in MUFA's responses to important changes in the University environment in Ontario and on changes engendered by these events to our relations with the President and his advisors.

JOINT ADMINISTRATION AND MUFA COOPERATION

THE TWO-TIER PROPOSAL

When I, as MUFA President, and Mark Levinson, as Salaries Committee Chair, met with President Bourns to discuss salaries for 1975/76, he informed us that Ontario government funding cutbacks would not allow increases for faculty for the coming year. When he invited us to join him in developing a funding policy for presentation to the Ontario government, we accepted his suggestion.

McMaster, however, was not the only University considering a joint approach to the government and the principle of joint action expanded to include the presidents and faculty associations of many Ontario universities. Eventually this evolved to an approach known as the Two-Tier System. One tier to be composed of the Presidents of Ontario Universities, the other of the Ontario University Faculty Associations (OCUFA). The responsibility of these groups was to prepare funding demands for Ontario Universities and to present these policies to the Premier. MUFA had, of course, representation on OCUFA, and participated in discussions of the proposal. Both tiers were to lobby the government to replace student enrolments by a more realistic recognition of the components of university operations as the basis for determining levels of university funding. Our Executive devoted considerable time, from September 1974 to February 1975, to discussing this proposal, including OCUFA reports and a special general meeting to hear the OCUFA President's report on the objectives of the Two-Tier System and its development as a policy for all Ontario universities.

Arguments for and against the proposal were made and although we passed a motion authorizing the OCUFA/University Presidents to develop a proposal for province-wide bargaining, the Two-Tier proposal that was developed failed to gain our support. I believe that the proposal failed to gain the support of faculty associations across the province and that meetings with the Premier did not materialize until COU was established.

SALARY POLICY INNOVATION

Our Executive was concerned that there was no established policy at McMaster that defined salary increment levels based on years of service and on merit. Led by Mark Levinson (Engineering), MUFA proposed to President Bourns that MUFA and the President develop such a remuneration policy for faculty jointly. President Bourns accepted our proposal. We accepted his suggestion that for the 1975/76 academic year, McMaster should adopt a remuneration policy similar to one in effect at the University of Waterloo. The Progress-Through-the-Ranks Policy, with the agreement of the Administration and MUFA, was adopted for McMaster in 1976/77 and has remained in place, with various modifications, in succeeding years.

JOINT COMMITTEES

THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE

Another important advance, begun in 1974-75, led to what has become known as the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee. Prior to the establishment of the Joint Committee, an annual meeting of the MUFA Executive and the University President and other members of the Administration was held toward the end of the academic year. After the Faculty Club was established, the meeting was held there, with each group rotating as hosts. As I recall, various concerns of either side or both were discussed, but no formal agreements were made. The meetings provided an opportunity for each group to identify and discuss problems but not to define policy. I mention the tradition of these meetings because I believe them to be the basis for the formal establishment in 1978 of the Joint Committee to discuss “issues and concerns confronting the University” raised by the Administration or MUFA and, in the case of remuneration, to submit disagreements to Final Offer Selection which requires both parties to accept the Selection Officer’s choice of the Administration’s or MUFA’s offer.

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND DISMISSALS

In 1974, in an environment in which government cuts to funding threatened the job security of tenured faculty, the Administration established a Committee to prepare regulations concerning tenure and promotions. I believe that the committee included faculty or possibly that MUFA was invited to propose members. In any case, the Administration’s document was available to us and carefully studied by the Executive who suggested several revisions. In response, President Bourns proposed a small joint committee, to be chaired by Manny Zack, consisting of Deans Alvin Lee and Les King and Professors Frank Jones and Tom Truman [In April 1975 Harold Guite replaced Tom Truman]. Although this committee’s proposed task was to respond to the President’s concern for a specific revision suggested by the Association, their work extended to a complete review of the entire document. In view of the widespread concern about possible terminations, for financial reasons, of tenured faculty, those in tenure stream and those holding term appointments, we also proposed rules and regulations on Dismissal. When our Executive and the Administration approved the document in 1975/76, it went forward to Senate and the Board of Governors and was approved by both bodies in 1977. It endured, with some revisions, until 1992.

BUDGET

Although we discussed the University's budget situation with President Bourns, our request for MUFA representation on the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) failed. However, he did agree to have six faculty, one from each Faculty, on the President's Budget Advisory Committee. Although MUFA was not directly represented, it was influential in naming the faculty members on the Committee.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

In 1974/75, concerns about remuneration, appointments, and other conditions of employment generated a serious interest in collective bargaining among university faculty in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada. At our first Executive meeting, we established a Committee on the Responsibilities and Functions of the Faculty Association, with Bill Carment (Psychology) as Chair, which included study of collective bargaining in Canadian universities. In a report to the December 12, 1974 General Meeting, Dr. Carment reported a general increase in interest in collective bargaining on the part of university faculties in North America. In Canada, the University of Manitoba, St Mary's in Halifax, and Notre Dame in Nelson, B.C. were already certified for collective bargaining. The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) and OCUFA offered assistance to university faculties considering the union route. Carleton, York, and UBC were in the forefront of those considering formation of unions. At McMaster, MUFA allotted considerable time for discussion in Executive and General meetings. CAUT and/or OCUFA representatives addressed some of our meetings. However, a Special General Meeting to determine our members' wishes revealed only a weak interest in establishing a union. However, the exploration of unionization as well as new developments in Faculty-Administration relations led to new responsibilities for faculty.

LOCAL ISSUES

The issues so far discussed involved, in one way or another, third parties, such as CAUT, OCUFA and the government of Ontario. We also dealt with local issues, i.e., those which involved McMaster participants only. I include under this label, the Summer Stipend and Consulting Regulations.

SUMMER STIPEND

A summer stipend was introduced in 1948 following the establishment of Hamilton College as the administrative unit for the "hard" sciences. Only Hamilton College faculty, undertaking research in the summer, were eligible for stipends. Eligibility was extended to members of other Faculties "in the Sixties". During the 1973/74 academic year, University President Bourns advised the MUFA Executive that he intended to fold the summer stipend into departmental faculty salary accounts. There was strong faculty opposition to closing the programme. Although the MUFA Executive for 1973/74 and 1974/75 accepted President Bourns' argument for ending the summer stipend program, they suggested that, in addition to salary, other uses of the funds should be explored. The debate among faculty continued until the Fall of 1974 when the MUFA Executive endorsed a Joint Presidential/MUFA Committee recommendation that Summer Stipend funds be transferred to Faculty salary accounts, with the provision that up to \$100 per year would be available to every faculty member to finance scholarly activities. The Executive's recommendation was supported by a substantial majority vote.

CONSULTING

The Consulting Policy resulting from the work of a Joint Presidential/MUFA Committee was the result of true negotiation. In the initial meetings, the Administration and the MUFA members were at loggerheads but lengthy deliberations resulted in agreement and achieved a common perspective. The number of hours of permissible consulting was a major obstacle to agreement as the

Administration wished to set limits on the time faculty could undertake consulting while MUFA's representatives, John Campbell (History), Les Robb (Economics) and John Siddal (Mechanical Engineering) wanted no limits of time on consulting. The dispute was resolved in favour of the MUFA representatives' position. The final Report was approved by both parties in January 1975 and strongly approved by a membership the following month.

CONCLUSION

Although I believe that major changes in Faculty-Administration relations occurred in 1974/75, I do not claim that all such changes were achieved in that academic year. Some of the changes had been initiated in prior years, others were initiated by us but achieved in later years.

As I searched my memory to describe the involvement of MUFA in the life of the University in 1974/75, my first recollection was my admiration for all those who took on responsibilities in my year as President as well as in other years when I served MUFA. As President, I think I received a lighter teaching load but everyone else took on responsibilities in addition to commitments to research, teaching and other Faculty or departmental responsibilities. They did so because they strongly believed that it was the mission of all faculty to promote and maintain academic values. *Collegiality* was a prominent issue. Although faculty have expert knowledge to design courses and programmes, I think we recognized all members, students, staff, administrators, and faculty as University citizens with rights to participate in University decisions. As faculty, we achieved such recognition in the establishment of joint committees with high-level responsibilities and with faculty representation on the Board of Governors.

My experience with Joint Administration/MUFA committees leads me to be very supportive of this kind of problem-solving structure. I think joint committees work best when they co-exist with independent associations, such as MUFA, and an Administrative Officers Council. This structure ensures that each conflicting side has had the opportunity to work out a clear case for its solution to problems on the table and to elicit its constituency's response to recommendations from the joint committee. Such problem-solving structures should be considered for issues that may lead to conflict between the Administration and student groups or support staff.

Gerry Field

1975/1976

A Snapshot

The year 1975/76 is but a small part of a mosaic that constitutes the 50-year existence of the Faculty Association. But it represents a halfway house in its history, which began as an association of professors at a small sectarian university, and is now wishfully playing a significant role in the decision-making process of a large institution.

The year was also typical of that period in that it saw the beginnings of a transformation in the relationship of the Faculty Association with the Administration. The way was paved for a much more formal, constitutional role for the Faculty Association and its members in the affairs of the University. A case in point was the number of faculty to be directly elected to the Board of Governors, in addition to those elected by and from Senate. Not that the exertion of moral pressure was always ineffectual: the outcry that followed the announcement that the new Science and Engineering (Thode) Library was to be built in the Mall made the Administration change its mind. An almost identical situation arose again some twenty-odd years later in connection with the University Centre.

Internally, the Faculty Association changed, too. The need for closer and more frequent contact by the Executive with the membership was recognised, and resulted in the creating of a Council composed of representatives from all academic Departments. It was hoped that the creation of such a body would produce more active participation on the part of ordinary members. How effective a body Council has turned out to be in subsequent years is a matter of opinion. Other matters under consideration were: (1) full (as opposed to associate) membership of professional librarians ; (2) staffing the Faculty Association office. It was seen that a full-time Executive Assistant would be needed to cope with the mounting workload, as opposed to a part-time secretary. Joan Beckett was appointed and served the Association faithfully for many years thereafter.

Work on the Tenure Document continued, and was nearly completed by the end of that period. This was a document that was later accepted after much editing and negotiating. Its importance cannot be overstated. In our negotiations with the Administration it was agreed to pursue separately the question of Appeals Procedures (appeals against decisions on promotion, tenure, and dismissal) and this work was not completed by the end of my term of office.

Other negotiations were concerned with the basic salary structure (Career Progress and Merit Increases). In the past, negotiations had been carried out on the basis of our stated needs and comparisons with other universities in the province. What was lacking was detailed and timely information on McMaster's financial situation. Such information was not readily forthcoming and it took a number of years before this was achieved.

The need for defining the legal standing of the Faculty Association in these and other negotiations was recognized, and three main options were identified: (1) the *status quo*, exerting moral pressure (considered somewhat unsatisfactory by many); (2) having an external arbitrator or mediator become involved in the event of an impasse in negotiations (the so-called Toronto model); and finally, (3) certification as a union. This last option ran counter to the feelings of many of us who did

not see ourselves as employees, but rather as potential partners in the governance of the University. Nevertheless it was felt that all options should be looked into and a Collective Bargaining Committee was struck to study them and compare our situation with that in other Ontario universities. This unionization option was later used as a red herring in an attempt to stop the second option (arbitration) from being considered, but in later years it was arbitration that came to be used on a number of occasions. It is now formally accepted as a measure to be used as a last resort.

To complete the summary of the role of faculty in the affairs of the University, the question of representation of faculty on the Board of Governors and on various other University boards and committees (financial and other) should be mentioned. At first there was considerable resistance to such suggestions, but progress was made in 1975/76 and later years. The University President was shrewd enough not to bring matters to boiling point, and we were fortunate enough at that time to have a Vice-President (Administration), Mike Hedden, who had a feeling for the role of a university and of faculty within it. Matters such as the lack of advance information about the University's budget for the coming year, or the much-disliked Private Payroll still left plenty of room for improvement. The habit of doing special deals with individuals died hard. The idea of a "Joint Committee" as it is constituted and working nowadays, was started. It took as its model the various *ad hoc* Joint Committees that had both Faculty and Administration representatives on them to deal with special problems. Similarly, the idea was first mooted of having Faculty Association and MUSSA representatives on what would later become the Pension Trust Committee.

Other University Committees, such as the Parking Committee, showed little success in convincing the Faculty Association representatives that their role on the committee was taken seriously.

The bargaining, which won Les Robb his spurs as Salary Chairman in his first year on the Executive, resulted (after much sweat on his part) in an eventual increase from 8.0% to 8.1% during the salary negotiations of that year!!!

It would be difficult to single out all those individuals, whether members of the Executive or not, who put so much time and energy into their allotted tasks during that year. But I must make an exception for the main architects of the Tenure Document: Harold Guite, Frank Jones, and Tom Truman.

Mark Levinson

1976-1977

My Affair With MUFA 1971-1979²⁵

It was with great pleasure that I received an unexpected call from Bernadette Lynn in mid November of 2000. Dr. Lynn told me that MUFA was planning to publish a *Festschrift* volume in 2001 to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of the McMaster University Faculty Association. As a former President of the Association, I was invited to submit an account of my experiences during my presidential year 1976/77). Without any hesitation I gladly accepted that kind invitation.

During the next several weeks, as I thought about the matter, it seemed to me that such a piece would be somewhat artificial. By that I mean that since I had served on the MUFA Executive Committee for seven years during the period 1971-79 it would not be easy for me to separate that single year, and its specific issues from the years that both preceded and followed it. To use a “buzz word,” not unpopular with politicians and academic administrators, it seemed more sensible to write a “holistic” piece about the entire period of my service on the MUFA Executive Committee. Furthermore, during my service on the Executive Committee I undertook a variety of tasks on University and external committees and bodies.

Those added tasks tended to complicate matters in that I had to be careful to avoid conflicts of interest. Those various responsibilities will be noted at appropriate places in the ensuing narrative. What allowed me, in my own mind, to deal with those complications was my belief in the traditional “idea of university” as a community of scholars together with a modified “Winchian” view that the faculty was the most vital force in the University. My interpretation of that view was that the faculty, to be true to itself, must faithfully serve both their students and their disciplines. A corollary to that position was that the appropriate role of the administration was to do its best to facilitate the ability of the faculty to carry on with its tasks. I was hardly so naive as to believe that was the way that a real university really worked but it was a nice ideal to keep in mind. The positions which I took were reached, I would hope, remembering what that ideal was, although, of course, to get things done one frequently has to make compromises. If those compromises become gross violations of principle then it is time to leave. I realize that those more concerned with status and position than with principle will take these to be the views of the foolish person. So be it, although I would suggest that they recall the words of Martin Luther, not in general a hero of mine, at the Council of Worms almost 500 years ago.

Enough for “philosophy” since it is now time for some history. Of course an historian telling his or her own story might be likened to a lawyer pleading his or her own case. However these pages constitute a memoir and not a scholarly work of history.

²⁵I chose the off-beat title because many academics have such a strong bond to their disciplines that it is almost a metaphoric marriage and activities that intrude on that commitment seem to be something like an extramarital affair. I am happy to say that the affair with MUFA did little to diminish my commitment to, and fecundity in, my discipline of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, frequently called Engineering Mechanics.

1971-1973: My Years as Chairman of MUFA's Special Enquiries Committee

When I was elected to the MUFA Executive Committee in 1971, shortly after my promotion to the rank of Professor received Board approval,²⁶ the incoming President, Norm Rosenblood, asked me to assume the Chairmanship of the Special Enquiries Committee. As most readers must appreciate, that is not a position which one eagerly seeks. However, that committee's functions are important to the membership of MUFA as well as, in reality, to the proper functioning of the University itself. The Committee, in addition to protecting the rights, privileges, and welfare of aggrieved faculty members, has the necessary role of ensuring that the Administration, at any level, is helped to maintain its integrity with respect to University regulations and standards. Those in positions of authority and power, certain of themselves, may suffer from the temptation to seek short cuts in carrying out their responsibilities. Because of their understandable human frailty, the Special Enquiries Committee should act as the Administration's "Jiminy Cricket".²⁷

In the two years when I served in that position I had the conscientious assistance of several colleagues from various Faculties in addition to the Association's President who served *ex officio* on all MUFA committees.

During those two years the Committee had to deal with several difficult cases concerning the reappointment or tenuring of faculty members with nonstandard qualifications or filling nonstandard positions. I have always been troubled by the mind sets of some academic administrators who have great trouble in dealing with such cases; they seem too much to prefer people who pop out of "cookie cutters" and drop into equally well defined positions. Apparently, thinking is a trying job for all of us. Why they have such trouble dealing with innovative teachers of language skills and people in creative areas, for example, has always puzzled me since I enjoy dealing with unusual, challenging problems. I wonder if this has anything to do with the emergence of "academic administration" as a profession in the decades following World War II when North American universities expanded greatly. Previously, most administrative positions were filled, as an obligation of service, by seasoned academics who had proven themselves capable of carrying out such chores after having established their own scholarly credentials.

In addition, the Committee dealt with other matters such as:

- a. the question of whether it was appropriate for the University to hold official functions at the facilities of groups which had restrictive membership policies that normally would have excluded the regular use of those facilities by some members of the McMaster community. That matter was raised by Gordon Vichert, then a member of the Department of English, when a banquet was held at the Hamilton Golf and Country Club (Ancaster);
- b. comments and recommendations on revisions to the tenure and promotion document. I suspect that this comes up every few years;
- c. a case involving Faculty rights in determining student grades and appeals thereof; and
- d. the salaries and ranks of women members of the Faculty as compared to men of similar qualifications.

²⁶Technically my promotion was to Professor of Mechanical Engineering; my title changed on July 1, 1971 when my appointment was transferred to the Department of Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics.

²⁷Character in Walt Disney's animated film "Pinocchio", circa 1939.

The last matter was raised initially, I suspect, by my friend Lynn McDonald before I assumed the Chair of the Committee. I learned of it when Norm Rosenblood handed me a file folder containing personnel data provided by most women then members of the McMaster Faculty. At that time the best that we were able to do was to make crude counterpart studies in the few cases where counterpart male colleagues were willing to provide their personnel data for comparison. There seemed to be little evidence of discrimination after a woman was hired, and that was the rub. Few women, at that time, had been hired outside of the female ghettos of nursing, women's physical education, and, possibly, social work.

In the fall of 1971, the limited MUFA study of the Status of Women members of the McMaster Faculty made me receptive to the efforts then being made by the Group for Equal Rights at McMaster (GERM) to raise the subject before the University Senate. As an individual I participated in their work and I was encouraged by Lynn McDonald to attend, and speak at, a Senate meeting at which any member of the McMaster community might take the floor. That meeting occurred on November 10, 1971. My then Dean, Les Shemilt, told me afterwards that my remarks were the best before the Senate on any matter during the two years that he had been at McMaster. Immediately after I spoke, Dennis McCalla, then the Dean of Science, moved the question on the motion then before the Senate. That motion provided for a serious study of the Status of Women members of the McMaster Faculty. Shortly thereafter the University administration set up committees to deal with other women on campus not covered by the Senate's action. I was asked to serve on the President's Committee which dealt with the concerns of women in the support and service staffs. In subsequent years I also served on the Senate Committee on the Status of Women; that was the committee which was created on November 10, 1971. In addition, another almost immediate result of GERM's efforts was the revision of the admissions procedures for medical students at the then new McMaster Faculty of Medicine. I served as a "community member" on the Admissions Committee of the Faculty of Medicine for three years, 1972-1974. That was the most satisfying committee work which I have ever done. In my "chameleon mode" I had some fun asking the candidates, as a final question, to identify the non-medical member of the interviewing panel. Rarely did a candidate immediately identify me; we rarely wasted much time on that point.

In 1973 I did not stand for re-election to the Executive Committee since I would be spending much of the 1973-1974 academic year at Cornell University while on a sabbatical leave.

1974/1975: Back on the Executive Committee as Chairman of the Salary Committee

During the spring of 1974 I had to interrupt my leave in order to spend several days at home in Hamilton. It so happened that the MUFA AGM took place at that time and a departmental colleague asked me to go to the meeting with him. On our walk over to the AGM my colleague said that he wanted to nominate me, from the floor, for the MUFA Presidency. I demurred, noting that the Nominating Committee had done well the year before in putting Frank Jones up to be the Vice-President, i.e. the President-Elect, and that I would not stand in opposition to Frank. My friend was not satisfied until I said that he might nominate me to stand for election to the Executive Committee again. He did so and I was elected.

All was peaceful during my last two months at Cornell. Little did I suspect that it was the proverbial "lull before the storm". When I returned to campus in June it was to learn that my colleagues on the Executive Committee had decided, without my knowledge or consent, that I was just the person to be Chairman of the Salary Committee. I was aghast at the thought of having that job. Before I could refuse the assignment I was rushed over to a meeting at President Bourn's office to discuss salary matters with Art Bourns and Mike Hedden, the very capable and decent Vice-President, Administration. Frank Jones and Gerry Field, the new MUFA Vice-President, were with me. I do not remember the details of that meeting which occurred early during the surging inflation of the 1970s. However, there had been much agitation to institute collective bargaining for faculty at

other, less happy, Ontario universities. What I do remember is that after the meeting concluded, Art invited us to join Mike and him for a drink at the Faculty Club. I remember that when we settled there Art tossed out a red herring saying, "...I guess that we'll have a union on campus soon...." I shot back, "...That'll be your choice as much as ours...." Nothing substantive came out of that meeting or any others that year because there were no real negotiations. However, since the Province boosted the BIU by a significant amount for the coming year, the faculty received a 15% salary increase for the 1975/76 academic year and I was seen to be something of a hero by many people. It was assumed that in my position as the Chairman of the Salary Committee that I had worked some kind of magic when in fact the substantial boost in salaries was typical for Ontario universities that year; in fact, it would have been the same if I had not existed.

If I accomplished anything in MUFA's discussions with the administration it was to start something more fundamental. What I immodestly may call the "Levinson Doctrine" maintained that in times of financial exigency the continuing academic health of the University demanded that the Administration allow full collegial participation in the financial affairs as well as the academic affairs of the University since those aspects were no longer separable if, indeed, they ever were so. This radical idea was not accepted when first put forward. However, over the next several years small but noticeable advances were made in MUFA input on such matters. These steps, however, were tenuous because nothing was formalized and so much depended on the trust between individuals. My understanding is that after I left McMaster, just as Art Bourns retired from the Presidency, the succeeding Administration was neither collegial nor trustworthy. My estimate of how that Administration might function was a not insignificant factor in my 1980 decision to accept an endowed professorial chair at the University of Maine.²⁸

In January of 1975 the Faculty of Engineering elected me to fill a long vacant seat on the University Senate. Within a matter of weeks David Winch asked me whether I had seen a disturbing article in the student newspaper. When I said that I had seen it, David asked if I would be willing to bring the matter to the attention of Senate in the form of a question for the Vice-President (Academic). Since, at that time David was also a member of Senate, I asked why he was not planning to do so. His response was that it was too important a matter to allow a possible clash of personalities to colour the discussion; David had the habit of giving the Chairman of Senate, Art Bourns, an unnecessarily hard time at Senate meetings. I accepted the task without great enthusiasm. The matter was something that the then Vice-President (Academic) had done which subverted the Tenure and Promotion document in order to finesse a potentially unpleasant situation. I took the question to the next Senate meeting. What ensued, over the course of two meetings, need not be examined in detail here. Suffice it to say that when it came to making a ruling on choosing the truth or a red-faced Vice-President's distortion, Art Bourns ruled from the Chair in favour of the truth. It was clear to see that it was not an easy decision for him to make. It would be hard not to remember such a man with some affection.

At this point I wish to inject a totally personal comment. A reader, not knowing me, reasonably might ask how I managed to keep up with my professional obligations to my students and my

²⁸I met Art Bourns shortly after I came to McMaster in 1967 and we had had an amiable relationship even when we did not see eye-to-eye. Somehow, in a way I cannot explain, we had learned to trust each other. I found his views to be a little narrow at times, but honestly held. At times he could be persuaded to change his position if it was for the good of the University. He frequently said that he very much missed classroom teaching; I tended to take this as administrative "boiler plate" but I was wrong there. In 1997 I met a former undergraduate student of Art's while attending the Annual Meeting of the Society for the History of Technology and learned that Art had been a good, devoted teacher whose door was always open to students even after he had become the Dean of Science.

discipline. As I look back to the 1970s I too am amazed to note that neither my students nor my research suffered during the period I served on the Executive Committee; student evaluation and my publications will confirm what I have just said. Without my affair with MUFA, I might have published a few more papers or been more active in professional societies, or perhaps not, since I was an avid fisherman at that time.

1975/1976: My Vice-Presidential Year

What first comes to mind about my year as Vice-President of MUFA is that because of unexpected, pressing personal demands on Gerry Field's time, he pressed me into service for a number of more-or-less ceremonial duties. The most notable, because it took me away from campus for three or four days in the fall of 1975, was attendance at the annual AUCC meeting, held that year in Ottawa. McMaster, at that time, included the MUFA President in its contingent to that gathering of administrators from all over Canada. Only born administrators can look forward to such meetings. However, I cannot deny that I enjoyed myself; Art Bourns let us "fifth wheels" know when we might as well go and see the sights rather than suffer through a boring session. What reinforces my memory of those few bland days is that on the Saturday after returning to Hamilton I received a Saturday morning call from Art Bourns, who at the time was at a meeting of the Senate Appointments Committee. He told me that the Committee wished for me to serve on the Joint Board/Senate Long-Range Planning Committee which was then being constituted. I accepted after some gentle arm-twisting; after all, how else could I occupy my spare time?

Almost the first thing that the new Committee did was to set up a task force to recommend a site for the recently authorized new Science and Engineering Library. Since I was the only member of the Faculty of Engineering who sat on the Planning Committee there was no way for me to avoid sitting on the task force. The job before the task force hardly constituted long-range planning, but somebody had to do it. It turned out that the job was not too demanding because Ron Gillespie, a truly distinguished chemist and the Chairman of the Long-Range Planning Committee, knew exactly where the new library should go. After some relatively perfunctory deliberations, the task force saw the wisdom of Ron's choice.

At about the same time MUFA's Executive Committee established a standing Committee on Academic Affairs to identify and study "appropriate matters," a rather vague charge. The Vice-President was to chair that new committee. Neither my memory nor my files give any evidence that the Committee ever functioned while I was a member of the MUFA Executive Committee.

During that year much time was devoted to refining the new Appointments, Tenure and Promotion Document which received Senate and Board approval in the fall of 1976 after I had become President of MUFA. At about the same time, the Provincial Legislature enacted the *McMaster University Act, 1976*. That revised charter allowed the University to revise its governing structure. Shortly afterwards the *McMaster University Faculty Handbook*, prepared by a joint Administration/MUFA committee was published after being checked for consistency with the Act; I still have a near mint copy in my files.

There was much effort in 1975/1976 by CAUT and OCUFA to ensure that MUFA was kept apprized of developments in collective bargaining at Canadian universities. McMaster faculty members seemed to have little interest in the topic. As I recall, that was so because, in spite of many continuing problems, we thought that the situation at McMaster differed significantly from those at the universities which had chosen to unionize. My personal position, which somewhat troubled Art Bourns, was that the support staff might be wise to choose collective bargaining, but that the faculty might have more to gain by continuing, and perhaps expanding, the informal pressures that were working reasonably well, if slowly — why cede any "management rights" to the Administration, as

collective bargaining would? I thought it better to pretend, with David Winch, that “... the faculty *is* the University....”

1976/1977: My Presidential Year

Usually, after being installed as the President of MUFA in late spring, one has a relatively peaceful time until the new academic session begins in the following fall. As I recall, I was in that position in 1976. Consequently, I was able to devote a little more time to my then current research and do some bass fishing before going to the low countries in late August. My main reason for taking that trip was to deliver a paper on “Physically Nonlinear Elasticity” at the 14th International Congress of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics which took place in Delft that year. We also made a side trip to Antwerp where the 400th anniversary of Peter Paul Rubens’ birth was being celebrated. All in all, that was a great holiday!

The following fall found me back on campus to face the more mundane concerns of MUFA, the McMaster Senate, and the Joint Board/Senate Long Range Planning Committee. The matter of collective bargaining passed away quietly.

Something which troubled both MUFA and the Administration was the matter of differential fees for visa students. The Provincial government had imposed a fee arrangement over the strong objections of the universities of Ontario. The McMaster Administration had decided to bear those costs for the following year while simultaneously continuing to attempt to persuade the Province to rescind that policy; the Board of Governors promptly voted to back the Administration’s decision.

Late that fall, just before the MUFA fall General Meeting, MUFA received an urgent appeal for financial support from the Laval University Faculty Association, then concluding a long, bitter strike. The Executive Committee decided to pass the matter on to the membership at the General Meeting without a recommendation. Personally, I had wanted to ask the membership to vote to have MUFA make a modest donation to the empty LUFA coffers as an indication of support from Anglophone Ontario. In addition, in spite of my opposition to having a faculty union at McMaster, I could see that the faculty of a university run by an authoritarian administration might see collective bargaining as a necessity. The membership of MUFA declined to give LUFA any financial support. I was disappointed and sent off a clearly indicated personal cheque with the letter informing LUFA of MUFA’s decision.

The year had gone rather smoothly and I was looking forward to becoming Past-President of MUFA. A week or two before I was to leave the Presidency I sent “thank you notes” to the members of my Executive Committee and a number of them replied with kind notes of their own. David Inman, that consummate wordsmith and man of the theatre, sent me an especially elegant note. In it, David noted that the year had passed very well under my leadership. Using, I assume, a horse show analogy, he suggested that it would be good for me to stumble, ever so slightly as I exited the ring. Little did he or I know that such a thing would happen at the AGM.

For several years Art Bourns and I, off the record, had come to the view that it would be good, if it could be done, to increase the salaries of junior faculty while maintaining the total career income constant. We both considered that it would be politically impossible to effect such a utopian reform. However, I hoped to make an attempt to move in that direction in, literally, the waning moments of my Presidency. The reason to make such a change is clear enough since junior faculty members are always hard pressed to make ends meet, while the financial pressures on them are less in their later years.

In the spring of 1977 the MUFA Salary Committee and the Administration agreed upon a slight move in the direction of such a reform, and the Executive Committee agreed to recommend it to the

AGM. At the meeting, the recommendation was not well received and the support for it from the Executive Committee dissolved faster than a small piece of dry ice put under a blow torch. The only strong support which the recommendation received came from Bert Brockhouse, the physicist who won the Nobel Prize a decade later. Bert and I had always had a pleasant personal relationship although our politics were poles apart and so I was pleasantly surprised at his support. No such support came from any of my self proclaimed “progressive” colleagues.

Thus ended my year as MUFA’s President with the slight stumble that David Inman had suggested would display gracious, good form.

1977-1979: My Past Presidential Year and Beyond

My year as Past President passed by easily as such years usually do. Harold Guite, a most conscientious man, was a good President and no real crisis arose in that year. I had become more heavily involved in the increasing work of the Board/Senate Long Range Planning Committee which was obligated to deliver a report by June of 1978. Early in the 1977/1978 Academic Session I was made a member of a five-person steering committee of the LRPC. I became meeting-shocked in the process. Furthermore, in June 1977, as I returned from presenting a paper before the Canadian Congress of Applied Mechanics in Vancouver, I was asked to serve as the Senate’s Academic Colleague to accompany the University’s President to COU meetings. In my two years on COU there were times that I said things that Art Bourns might have wanted to say, but which would have been impolitic for him to say; I always made it my business to sit at some distance from Art so that it would be clear to the Council that I was my own “loose cannon” and not Art’s “cat’s paw”. However, my behaviour at COU could not have been too outrageous because the Council nominated me to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, i.e., the Provincial Government, for a seat on the OISE Board of Governors. In effect, I was to be COU’s “bulldog” there and to protect, if necessary, the interests of the universities of Ontario. That became necessary at one point when the University of Toronto wanted OISE to award its own graduate degree rather than have the University of Toronto do it. OISE threatened to embarrass the University of Toronto over the matter. I made it bluntly clear that the universities of Ontario could not tolerate that.

In the winter of 1978 the Chairman of the Board/Senate LRPC suffered a case of severe physical exhaustion. Ron Gillespie, a really nice man who had just been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society (London), had burned the candle at both ends for too long. Art Bourns pressed me to take over Ron’s job for the few months remaining until the Committee’s report was to be delivered to the Board and to the Senate.²⁹ The next few months were something of an ordeal, but I managed it and the report was delivered on time. Both bodies receiving the report approved it with only minor changes. I was now a free person after serving three years on the LRPC.

Normally MUFA past-presidents quietly fade away, but, just before my term on the LRPC came to

²⁹Legally, not being a Canadian citizen, I was not eligible to assume the Chairmanship of the LRPC since the Chairperson was a member of the Board of Governors, *ex officio*. The *McMaster University Act, 1976* required that a Board member be a Canadian citizen. That xenophobic requirement had been inserted into the draft *Act* by the University because a timid Art Bourns thought that Provincial Government of the day might scuttle the *Act* if that provision was not included. At the Senate meeting considering the draft *Act*, I had argued that the University not include that xenophobic provision but should not resist a Government insistence to insert it. Little did Art Bourns or I know that I would be the first person subjected to that provision of the *Act*. The Administration concocted a way to skirt the *Act*. I became the acting-chairman of the Committee and was invited to attend those portions of the Board meetings where the work of the LRPC was to be discussed. At least I was able to avoid the rest of those rather boring meetings which were, largely, rubber stamping what the Administration brought forth. To keep things that way, the Administration made sure to see that the University never ran a deficit.

an end, I was again nominated for a seat on the MUFA Executive Committee. By then I guess that I had forgotten “no” . It was not clear to me as to what I would be expected to do.

Not too long into the next Academic Session, 1978/1979, some problems arose on the Executive Committee and for the first time, to my knowledge, the Executive Committee of MUFA voted “no confidence” in its President. It was a sad business since the President had been a good person who, at that time, was rapidly losing touch with the situation that MUFA and the University were then finding themselves in. Fortunately, the internal turmoil that development engendered settled down quickly and the rest of my final year as a member of the Executive Committee involved, for the most part, continuing efforts to extend faculty involvement in University budgetary matters.

A year later I left McMaster to take up an appointment as the Arthur O. Willey, Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Maine. I shall always remember my thirteen years as a member of the McMaster faculty. They were, perhaps, the best in my academic career, with my participation in MUFA being no small part of those years.

Harold F. Guite

1977/78 and 1978/1979

I have found it very difficult to write this account of my two Presidencies, 1977/78 and part of 1978/79. My memory of what happened is defective, and even a perusal of the minutes doesn't recreate the significant things that went on between meetings. I can write about Julius Caesar without upsetting too many people, but in attempting a brief summary of the myriad activities of MUFA in 1977-1979 I shall inevitably fail to name people who expect to be named, and some of the people I have named may quite rightly think that they deserve a more favourable mention. So my apologies to those whom I have disappointed in any way. Then there's the perilous enterprise of writing about people who are no longer able to set the record straight, but whose family and friends may be hurt by my comments. My apologies to them if I've been at all unfair.

When I arrived at McMaster in 1967 I was no stranger to faculty associations. Immediately on my appointment to Manchester in 1947 I had joined the local Association of University Teachers (AUT). It wasn't a very lively organization, and junior members of faculty were not encouraged to stir things up. The Presidency rotated, rather like the Deanships, among the senior professors, who celebrated their elections with brief and anodyne speeches. Ibadan (1956-63) was very different. When I arrived there was no AUT, only a Lecturers' Association (LA). Most of the Professors, rejoicing in their early promotion, had no interest in an AUT, but I think that after serving as Secretary of the LA I managed to convert it into an AUT. My brief but hectic spell (1963-67) at the University of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (now the University of Zimbabwe) was very different. I think that I founded the AUT there, and I certainly became its President. Our presence as a tiny multi-racial enclave in a very racial society was a source of continual friction and gave rise to numerous occasions for speech, writing and action. There was such a dearth of experienced and socially concerned academics that I soon found myself serving simultaneously as Head of Department, Dean, Senator, Chairman of several University committees, AUT President and member of the Board of Governors' Executive.

So I came to MUFA with a good deal of experience both of negotiation within universities and of representing them to the public. However MUFA was an established institution that enjoyed the services of numerous competent persons who were familiar with the Canadian scene. So my priorities were to acclimatize myself to Canadian life and to concentrate on the detailed procedures of establishing a PhD in Roman Studies. But I attended all MUFA's General Meetings, read all the documents, and as soon as I had gained sufficient experience made brief interventions. After some years I was invited to stand for election to the Executive. Having in due course been elected, I was able to serve the Association either by appointment to one of its Standing Committees or by representing it on other bodies within the University. By 1976/77 I had become Chairman of the Tenure Committee and was then elected President for 1977/78.

Mark Levinson, President in 1976/77, had persuaded the University to recompense the MUFA President's Department for half of his or her teaching load. This was a generous gesture, but it was also a recognition that MUFA was saving the Administration a good deal of time and trouble. Any member of faculty who wanted MUFA support in pursuing a grievance had first to take his or her case to the Special Enquiries and Grievances Committee. My experience, when I served on this Committee, was that in about half of the cases we had to tell the complainant either that he or she didn't have a strong case or that we could help him or her to solve the problem informally. Knowing that we examined grievances thoroughly, the Administration took us seriously when we did bring a case. However the effect of compensation for the Department that provided MUFA with a president was that we needed to elect our president a year in advance so that the Department could plan his

or her replacements. The obvious mechanism was to elect a vice-president who would automatically succeed to the presidency in the following academic year. The Executive began by accepting this in principle, but, being fearful that the vice-president might do something outrageous during his term of office, they preferred to have his election as president confirmed by ballot. However, I persuaded them that a rogue president was a risk they had to run. This automatic succession worked without a hitch. When the members of MUFA voted for a vice-president they knew perfectly well that they were also voting for a president.

The President of an American university once observed that his main problems were the provision of sex for the students, something else (I forget what), and parking for the faculty. Parking did indeed generate passion, and our Executive spent a good deal of time on it. There were two problems. The first was that many car owners considered it an intolerable hardship to walk more than fifty yards from their cars to their offices. The second one was that car-driving students maintained that they had exactly the same right to convenient parking as faculty and staff. Rationing by price didn't work and could only have worked if prices had been set at morally unacceptable levels. As it was, there were more people willing to pay higher prices for convenient parking than there were spaces available. There were no guaranteed spaces for anyone: a parking permit was popularly described as a hunting license.

I was not personally concerned, since I deliberately lived within walking distance. And I felt much sympathy with Ronald Gillespie when he deplored the paving over of green areas to create more parking spaces. But MUFA policy was made by the Committee, and when they sent me to talk to President Bourns, as they frequently did, I fought hard in the interest of my car-driving colleagues. I was not alone, of course, since we always had a representative on President Bourns' Users' Parking & Traffic Committee. We didn't accept the students' contention that they had exactly the same rights to convenient parking as we had, and we actually got it across to President Bourns that if a space-hunting student was late for lecture one student was disadvantaged, whereas if a space-hunting professor was late as many as a hundred students could be disadvantaged. But this breakthrough didn't lead to any change in policy. The moment there was any talk of preferential treatment for faculty the students threatened to create chaos by blocking every entrance to the campus. Faculty could easily have done the same, but President Bourns knew quite well that we would never dream of doing such a thing. We even discouraged faculty from lawful forms of protest. In situations like this President Bourns always appealed to us to "behave responsibly", by which he meant that we ought not, whatever the moral strength of our case, try to pressure him into action which would paralyze the campus to the delight of the news hounds and their television crews. We understood his dilemma, but we took it hard that threats of disruption should triumph over reasoned argument.

This happened in other fields besides parking. It was clear that keeping the television cameras off the campus was a cardinal feature of administrative policy. When a student orator, followed by a small banner-waving cohort, made an impassioned speech about the intolerable hardship, not to say denial of human rights, caused by the closure of the Student Union in the small hours, the Administration did not pause to enquire and consult. Staff were somehow found and a twenty-four hour operation was in place the very next day.

What took most of our time was salaries. Negotiations were more complex than in British and British-style universities, which only had to cope with across-the-board and progress-through-the-ranks. In addition to these factors we also had to accommodate merit pay and to determine its distribution across the ranks and age-groups. We were fortunate in being served by a succession of Salary Committee Chairmen who were able to cope with the complexities. The money available to McMaster for salaries bore no relations to the quality of staff or to the cost of their teaching and research equipment except where these were taken care of by *ad hominem* research grants. The money available for salaries, as for everything else, was mechanically determined by the computation of our Basic Income Units as compared with the Basic Income Units of the other thirteen Ontario

universities. Having served in a university where Fellows of the Royal Society and Nobel Prize Winners were content with their annual increments (and didn't get even these when they reached the professorial maximum), I was not convinced of the merit of merit pay. There was no doubt that its judicious use enabled McMaster to retain some brilliant researchers, though I was shocked to discover that some people were applying for posts without the slightest intention of accepting them but simply to force McMaster to give them a large merit increase. I also discovered that some Deans were unable to resist the temptation to use the merit fund for social engineering, a tendency which also invaded the career-progress mechanism. At an Executive meeting on April 14, 1978 David Winch pointed out that senior faculty were in fact having their salaries reduced in real terms. But by this time it was too late to do anything about it.

Just before I became President we had to cope with another crisis. The custom had grown up for the Salary Committee, instructed by the Executive, to negotiate over a period with the Administration and then for representatives of the Executive to meet President Bourns, do some final horse-trading, and reach the best settlement they could get. Both sides then considered this agreement as binding for the next session. But on this occasion the Executive refused to accept the agreement reached by its representatives. I have two vivid mental photographs of this event. Even before we had time to gather up our papers and leave, the President was on the phone telling his fellow Presidents the McMaster figure. The second scene is the adjournment of the Faculty Association Executive, with an agitated Mark Levinson sprinting to the nearest phone to tell President Bourns of the disaster that had befallen their agreement. When the negotiators reported formally to President Bourns he was not at all pleased. Neither was Les Robb, who had been Chairman of the Salary Committee and who now quite properly refused to take part in any attempt to change the agreement. There was much division of opinion among the faculty, less, regrettably, about the proprieties than about the ability of the University to meet MUFA's demands. The Administration's cautious budgeting meant that there was always a surplus at the end of the financial year. Some seized on this as evidence that the University could have given us more if it had really wanted to. Others said that the University should pay us properly even if it meant running a deficit: the Ontario Government would have to bail us out in the end. Having been brought up with a horror of debt, and never having gone into the red when I handled public funds, I came out strongly against this idea, as I also did against the proposal to plunder the budget item that maintained McMaster's physical amenities. At this point John Burbidge became Chairman of the Salary committee and I succeeded to the Presidency. The AGM had supported the outgoing Executive, but the new Executive reinstated the original agreement with President Bourns. When we submitted our salary proposals for 1978/79 to a mail ballot we got 175 votes in favour, with 3 against. The subsequent negotiations with President Bourns were tortuous and strained. But they strengthened our growing conviction that our position would be weak as long as we were denied access to full budgetary information.

Faculty were in an unenviable position. Our negotiators could easily demonstrate that we were comparatively underpaid. But if they fought hard over a decimal point they were denounced as inflexible and unsympathetic to the constraints that bound our paymasters. If, after giving way over the decimals for several years in a row, they used a financial upturn to demand catch-up, they were pilloried as greedy and unrealistic. Every so often the troops would become restive and there would be talk of industrial action, a regular feature of Ontario life. Whenever this happened the Ontario government would urge us both publicly and privately to be "responsible". But when their own teachers struck or threatened to strike the government caved in every time, unable to withstand the pressure of parents whose sole concern was to get their children off the streets. The result of this was that a McMaster student who had been on strike three times during her first five years as a high school teacher was better off than if she had stayed on to take a PhD and been appointed an assistant professor. A McMaster Engineering graduate didn't even need to strike: in his first year of employment he earned more than the assistant professor who had taught him. The Ontario government also told us that they would be perfectly happy for us to receive higher salaries: all we had to do was to reduce the faculty complement. Since the student-staff ratio was already higher

than in many schools and absurdly high in particular Departments, no one that I can remember took this proposal seriously. Salary negotiation was still a major preoccupation when my first Presidency came to its strange end.

About a week before the AGM, which was on April 13, 1978, I was required to be an in-patient in MUMC for several days of monitoring before an operation on April 14. The nurses kindly provided me with a table in their sitting room at which I sat and wrote my Presidential Report. On the morning of April 13 I persuaded the Ward Sister to let me out for an hour and a half. I walked across to the Great Hall of the Faculty Club, opened the meeting at 9:30 a.m., gave my report, and walked back to MUMC with no harm done. Tom Truman, Vice-President, and Marianne Kristofferson chaired the rest of the meeting.

Much of my first Presidency had been taken up with the quest for a better method of salary negotiation. Most of the Executive found the Toronto model attractive, but it didn't commend itself to Vice-President Truman. We also studied the Queen's and Waterloo models. Another suggestion was that we should negotiate, not with President Bourns, but directly with the Board of Governors, an idea that won the support of a General Meeting. But the Executive rejected it as a pointless rebuff to a President who we thought (John Emery dissenting) understood collegiality better than the Board did. Regrettably, we lost John Emery over this. In the meantime demographic factors over which we had no control were threatening both faculty complement *and* salaries. Another factor in this knotty equation was the outsize personality of President Bourns. He was widely respected as a man of integrity who was sound on Tenure and Academic Freedom, but some considered him authoritarian and, worse, paternalistic, a label that wounded him deeply. Tom Truman, now President, and others felt that he was beginning to understand our position and genuinely wanted to move in our direction: we ought therefore to seize this as a favourable moment to press for radical reform.

Things now began to happen. Alvin Lee, Vice-President (Academic), became involved, and there emerged a proposal for a Joint Committee consisting of three representatives of MUFA, the President of the University, and his two Vice-Presidents. The Joint Committee would have four functions: (1) it would give MUFA the same information on budget and finance as President Bourns received; (2) the MUFA representatives would be invited to make a critical evaluation of alternative financial models; (3) MUFA would have input into the framing of the University's long-term financial strategy; (4) the Joint Committee could, not necessarily would, provide a mechanism for salary negotiation.

These proposals found favour with the Executive, who, on October 20, 1978, voted unanimously (something that hadn't happened for a while) to send four representatives to meet President Bourns and seek clarification on several issues. On October 30 we resolved by a vote of 8 to 3 to accept this document in principle and to submit it to the Council for consideration (the Council was an advisory body to which each Department sent a representative).

What now followed was astonishing and catastrophic. MUFA President Truman called a Special General Meeting for November 17 and had posters put up all over the University offering three alternatives: (1) a Toronto-style Agreement; (2) a Joint Administration-MUFA Committee; (3) unionization. He had no authority from the Executive to confront the membership with an option to unionize. A perusal of the minutes shows that unionization had only been alluded to once or twice as a theoretical possibility. When it was spoken of informally to President Bourns he had replied, "Go ahead, that's fine by me. Ontario Labour Law will secure for me the management rights that some people are always trying to take away from me." Even if we had considered unionization seriously we should never have put it to a General Meeting without the most careful preparation. After first making an in-depth study of unionized campuses and their rule books we would have visited a unionized campus and invited a union president to visit us. I estimate that we would have spent at

least six months on the question before we were ready to go to a General Meeting. The Executive meeting on November 14 required the President to take all his notices down and replace them with notices that made no mention of unionization. President Bourns now created a new complication by making a written request to attend the General Meeting. He had already angered members by questioning, on the grounds of low turnout and low postal voting figures, whether the Executive really represented the membership. We hoped that President Truman would be able to persuade him that his request was impolitic. Failing that, his letter would be read to the General Meeting and, if that Meeting approved, the Executive would invite him to a subsequent General Meeting. Our own divisions at this time were highlighted by the voting on this motion: 4 in favour, 2 against, 3 abstentions.

160 members attended the General Meeting. Full documentation was provided. John Emery distributed 60 copies of a personal statement, and there was a fierce debate between the proponents of the two alternatives that now remained on the agenda. Mark Levinson and Marianne Kristofferson moved that we accept what were now being referred to as “Bourns’ proposals” and that we should nominate three persons as members of the Joint Committee. This motion was carried by 82 votes to 64, with 4 abstentions. The Executive, meeting again on November 21, received a further protest from President Bourns about our refusal to invite him to the General Meeting of November 17. We also received with regret the resignation of John Emery and Louis Greenspan. Gerry Field sent in his resignation, which, however, was not accepted by the Executive. When we met again on December 5 Tom Truman had resigned from the Presidency, the Executive, and the Joint Committee. We accepted his resignation but wrote to him regretting the unhappiness caused by recent events and acknowledging his achievement in promoting a policy that had finally won approval. The Executive now made me Acting President, and a General Meeting on January 9, 1979 appointed me as President. When I told President Bourns about Tom Truman’s resignation he was appalled and castigated our treatment of him as unprecedentedly savage. In retrospect I think the Executive was right to compel his resignation, but the record shows that we tried to be both just and humane. In my second Presidential Address (at the AGM of April 24, 1979) I described myself as “the caretaker of another man’s revolution”, and commended both Tom Truman and Arthur Bourns for their “joint act of statesmanship”. The fact that the Joint Committee is still alive and well in 2001 is something that those who helped to create it, including those who opposed it, can justifiably take pride in.

With the road to equitable salary increases being blocked, our representatives on the Pensions and Benefits Committee did their best to improve our lot by fringe benefits. Some faculty wanted us to make this our main thrust rather than salary increase, and we had to point out that fringe benefits, though desirable in the present, wouldn’t do anything for our pensions. But there was a limit to what we could do when faced by the reluctance of the Board of Governors to increase the proportion of fringe benefits in relation to the total salary. Why they should object to fringe benefits that cost them nothing I failed to understand. After long haggling, a Dental Plan was approved. In February, 1978 we began to work on a scheme to help faculty by getting the University to guarantee mortgages. The Administration began by offering to guarantee a maximum mortgage of \$30,000, with the University’s total commitment limited to \$1,000,000. By June, Steve Link had got this up to \$2,000,000. I remember going to Mike Hedden, Vice-President (Administration), and arguing that this was still not very generous. But, for Mike, a prudent manager, even \$2,000,000 was too great a risk. I countered that there was no such risk: did he really think that his colleagues were going to default in droves? When he remained unconvinced I offered him odds of 10,000 - 1 against more than two defaults in any one year. My assessment was realistic. I can recall faculty who had borrowed ambitiously being caught by a surge in interest rates and being forced to sell, but I can’t recall anyone defaulting. The scheme we finally got wasn’t much help to anyone except those who wanted second mortgages.

I recall two other matters on which I failed to persuade him. Cardboard plates and plastic cutlery

in the cafeteria, I said, were damaging the environment. “Simple economics”, he replied, “The cost of disposables is less than the cost of employing washers-up, even if you have machines”. The other matter was a decree by the Administration, with no preliminary discussion that I can remember, that faculty were entitled to one month’s holiday a year. Most faculty laughed this off as irrelevant, but I felt that it was a subtle, though unintended, downgrading of our status that ought to be resisted.

“We faculty members”, I said, “are appointed primarily on our achievement as scholars and on the expectation of future achievement. We don’t work a 9-5 day, a 35-hour week, or a 48-week year. Even more important, we don’t work entirely at prescribed tasks for a specific employer. We do indeed spend some of our time working for McMaster by teaching and examining its students at prescribed times and by sharing in the administration of our Departments under the direction of our Chairmen. But we also work for other universities by examining their students, appraising their faculty, and contributing to their academic occasions. We share our knowledge with colleagues in other universities and other disciplines. We edit or assist in the editing of journals. We organize and participate in the conferences of learned societies. We belong to and administer the work of professional associations. We advise governments, sit on statutory bodies, and render a variety of public services. We do all this in Hamilton, in Ontario, all across Canada, and sometimes abroad. Who’s going to monitor and compute these activities to determine whether we’re taking more than four weeks off in a year? We’re privileged to take half or even a whole day off when we don’t have classes or committees. But when we have a difficult or urgent assignment, or when several duties are landed on us all at once, then we work 14 to 18 hours a day until we get clear. We spend time with family and friends, and take holidays like other people. But not even our holidays can be dissociated from our work. We’re paid to think and it’s difficult to stop thinking. One philosopher friend tells me that he gets his ideas sailing his boat in calm weather. Another tells me that he does most of his philosophy not at his desk but working in his garden. The Vice-President, having listened patiently to all this, said “No, Harold, I think one month a year is a reasonable holiday”. But Mike Hedden was a genial soul, easy to talk to, and more often than not we were on the same wavelength. His early retirement and premature death were a great loss to the University.

There was one fringe benefit that we were able to achieve on our own without any help from the Board. Vice-President Truman and Executive Assistant Joan Field negotiated a Group Insurance with Westrate Martus that enable some members to recoup the whole of their MUFA dues.

Besides trying to improve salaries and benefits we were also much occupied with pensions, on which we had a standing committee staffed by members who were prepared to put a lot of effort into mastering pension intricacies. We also had a representative on the University’s Pension Trust Committee. Successive representatives reported back to the Executive that they were denied access to the information that they needed to be effective. When we complained to President Bourns he put on his most authoritative *persona* to say slowly and with heavy emphasis, “In all their deliberations for the welfare of McMaster there is no area in which your Board of Governors takes more care and shows more concern than in the provision of your pensions”. We were unimpressed, recalling that the Chairman of his Pension Trust Committee had told us that the University had no obligation whatsoever to contribute anything to our Pension Plan. “Correct in law”, I commented, “but not very collegial”.

Once, when we did get some figures, I was so disgusted with the poor returns being achieved by the fund manager that I offered to devote my Saturday afternoons to running the Pension Fund free of charge. The President was not amused, but shortly after that the Board divided the fund between two managers and there was a marked improvement. Later, when the Fund was doing well, the Board exercised its right not to contribute. Faculty contributions, of course, continued as before.

An on-going problem during my Presidencies was the request of the librarians to be full members of MUFA. They were offered, but were not interested in, associate membership. There was no

difficulty about offering full membership to librarians who were also recognized scholars. But, apart from them, the obvious counterparts of faculty were the people who taught in library schools. The librarians, led by Elise Hayton, were very persistent, but their arguments were rather desperate. The students, they said, couldn't read the prescribed books or write the prescribed essays without the librarians telling them where to find the books; the librarians were therefore as much a part of McMaster's teaching operation as we were. I didn't find this cogent, but at a later stage I began to favour full membership as expedient. The librarians were quite capable of going on strike, and we didn't want them going on strike unless we, too, were on strike.

Another concern was our own membership. A substantial majority of the faculty belonged, but we were poorly represented in the Faculties of Medicine and Business, and Daphne Maurer, Chairman of the Membership Committee, reported that in 1977/78 only 20% of new faculty had joined. The medicals had such a powerful organization of their own that they needed no protection from us. But I embarked on a door-to-door campaign in the Business Faculty. One conversation sticks in my memory. "Why haven't you joined the Faculty Association?" "It's not cost-effective. We teach our students to maximize income and not pay anything out unless they absolutely have to. Now I don't have to pay a fee to MUFA in order to get the benefit of anything you achieve for my salary, fringe benefits, and other amenities. What's more, if I get into trouble MUFA will take up the cudgels for me whether I'm a member or not. So it would be bad practice to pay a fee to MUFA when I can get full service without paying a cent." Not a man I would like to be in a siege with. But they weren't all like that in Business. Dean Schlatter was a paid-up member and a good servant of the whole community.

Visiting, as well as phoning and writing, took time, but I found it helpful, and in most cases enjoyable, to meet people face to face. Whatever the mode of communication, I soon found that I was expected to know everything and to attend to the smallest detail myself. Joan Field did in fact attend to most of the detail, but I wasn't allowed to say "This is a routine matter, see Joan about it." Most people expected personal service from their President, and they felt free to buttonhole me at lunch or in the bar or to ring me at home at 11:00 p.m.

One of my responsibilities, before, during, and after my Presidencies was to share with other members of the Executive the duty of representing MUFA on CAUT, OCUFA, and other public bodies. This was time-consuming and involved a lot of travel, but it was useful to know what was happening in universities all across Canada and to have a say in national and provincial policy. Regrettably, however, there were continual claims by some of our members that we weren't getting value for money for the dues we paid to CAUT and OCUFA. There was, of course, some duplication of effort, but this was a perpetual Canadian problem, not just a university one. So the Executive had to spend time and energy making a case for our continued membership of both bodies. We argued that, quite apart from the practical help and advice that we received from time to time, it was worth paying something simply to be represented at provincial and federal levels; also that it was our duty to place our knowledge and experience at the service of our sister associations. We made modest contributions to various campaign funds, and gave moral support when it was needed, as when we backed the Sherborne Association's protest against its University Charter being revised without any reference to Faculty.

Our members often had strong convictions about items on the CAUT and OCUFA agendas, but I insisted that I could only take part as a representative, and not as a delegate: I would, of course, pay due heed to MUFA opinions, but I must be free to exercise my own judgment in the light of what was said in the debate.

On December 11, 12, and 13, 1977 the Executive hosted Dr. Gordon Jones, President of CAUT, and we did it in style with a General Meeting, at which he spoke, and with lunches at the Faculty Club and the Royal Hamilton Yacht Club, of which I was a member. We also had a buffet in our own

home, attended by the President and Vice-Presidents of the University and by local MPs and MPPs.

We took trouble to keep in touch with Hamilton MPs. The Executive protested to them when the federal government proposed to reduce the free distribution of government papers by 50%. I also spoke to the MPs myself, and three months later I was able to report to the Executive that the Minister had withdrawn his proposal insofar as it related to university libraries.

Re-reading the minutes, I'm impressed with the amount of work we got through, more than I can mention in a brief summary. The Tenure Document on which I had worked as Chairman of the Tenure Committee in 1976/77 came into force and Jules Carbotte monitored its operation. We protested against the Ministry's imposition of higher fees on foreign students. Elaine Nardocchio kept us informed on student evaluations of our teaching and their role in tenure and promotion. We had two meetings with the Students' Union Executive, co-operated with them in Orientation Week, and supported some of their requests to cancel classes in favour of demonstrations. We set experts to work on the proliferating problems of copyright. To counter our preoccupation with bread-and-butter issues we created an Academic Affairs Committee. We improved the mechanism of Sabbatical Leave. David Inman, George Thomas, and Joan Field, with assistance from Mannie Zack and others, put the whole University in their debt by publishing the *Faculty Handbook*. I was often obliged to Jack Evans, the Registrar, for reliable advice on the University *modus operandi*.

I end this memoir on a personal note. Out of all the stress and turmoil were born enduring friendships. Daphne Maurer, one of my successors in the Presidency and later protagonist in the court hearings on the ownership of the Pension fund, came with her husband Charlie to share our home in Cambridge, UK when I was on sabbatical leave in 1980/81. They have kept in touch and in the course of their world travel have several times made the long journey to Durham. Halfway through my first Presidency Joan Beckett became Joan Field. Gerry Field was President of MUFA before I was, and I owe much to his sage advice and moral support in times of crisis. They too, have kept in touch and visited us in Cambridge and Durham. Joan and I worked well together at all sorts of tasks. I have again a vivid mental photograph of the two of us walking round and round a large table all day long, concentrating fiercely as we operated a preferential and transferable vote system for elections to the Executive, ceaselessly transferring ballots from one pile to another until we got a final result. (The following year some clever man in Psychology devised a computer programme that did it much more quickly.) It was my privilege early in my first Presidency to make MUFA a responsible employer by providing Joan with a Pension Plan and Life Insurance. In my Presidential Report on April 24, 1979, I blessed her for giving MUFA continuity when an ordinary woman would have said "a plague on all your houses" and turned her back on a turbulence that contributed to the serious illness from which we now saw her happily recovered. I could also have repeated what I had said on April 13, 1978, when I thanked her for keeping me in order, pulling me back every now and then from the edge of disaster, and countering my fits of despair with her perennial cheerfulness.

Marianne Walters (Kristofferson)

1979/1980

My first act as incoming President of the Faculty Association was to accompany the out-going President, Professor Harold Guite, to the meeting of the Remuneration Committee of the Board of Governors where under the terms of the newly formed Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee to Consider Financial and Related Matters (henceforth referred to as the Joint Committee), the President of the Faculty Association was invited to attend and speak when the President of the University presented his remuneration recommendations. Somehow this invitation was extended to include me as well, and I was also invited to speak. My words had nothing to do with the remuneration decision to be made that day, but were about the Joint Committee: how I thought it was perceived by our faculty, its role, and the issues and concerns of faculty which I thought would be most prominent in the Joint Committee's work in the coming year. Basically I saw the Joint Committee as offering the potential for facilitating the growth of a *real* collegial system of governance. Only the week before, this first statement of purpose in the new Faculty Association constitution was approved at the Annual General Meeting: "The Association therefore supports the principle that faculty should play an active role in University governance". The Joint Committee offered a mechanism for achieving this.

With respect to issues and concerns I focused on the vulnerability of the growing number of faculty being appointed on Contractually Limited Appointments. It was at about this time that a noticeable number of such appointees were reaching the end of their contracts, and it was becoming apparent that tenure-stream appointments were not available for their continuation. There was great concern about the loss of these junior faculty. While the financial picture at the University was grim and getting grimmer, our administration had not made available even such obvious mechanisms as an early retirement plan and a portable pension plan as a way of relieving the financial pressures. I saw this as a high priority to address in the Joint Committee. Concern was also expressed for another very vulnerable group: our retired faculty. We needed to improve pensions — by indexing if possible.

Knowing that the Remuneration Committee was also going to consider a proposal for the introduction of a dental plan at this meeting, I said that if it were to be approved and funded it would mean that the dental plan was being given priority over those areas of concern that I had raised. So, I guess in a way I did speak to the decisions about remuneration. I recall that when Harold and I left the meeting, President Bourns hurriedly came out after us and asked me if that meant that the faculty did not want a dental plan at this time. I responded that the retention of junior faculty was more important to us. The dental plan was not approved that year, but the massive cut we feared in contract positions did not take place — more about that later.

As actually stated in a motion approved by the Executive, the early part of the year before my presidency was marked by "controversy, misinterpretation, intemperate language, suspicion, and battered feelings", all related to the approach to be taken to negotiate faculty salaries. At one point there was strong support to bypass the President of the University entirely and to negotiate remunerations directly with the Board of Governors, and there was also good support for trying to negotiate a "Toronto-style" process which would include a conflict resolution mechanism. And, of course, lurking in the background was the possibility of certification — however, I don't think this option ever had much support at McMaster. In the course of feeling out these possibilities, during the summer of 1978, President Bourns, in a meeting with the Faculty Association Executive gave his views on possible negotiating procedures and from these the shaping of the Joint Committee began. When the proposal for the Joint Committee was presented to a very well attended General Meeting,

having been previously accepted in principle by the MUFA Executive, the first vote produced a tie of 80 for and 80 against. After further discussion, the proposal was accepted with 82 in favour and 64 opposed.

The fall-out from this decision included a number of resignations from the Executive, from committee chairmanships, and finally the resignation of Professor Tom Truman, first from the Presidency of the Association, and shortly thereafter from the Executive. Professor Truman resigned in the hope that if he left, the work of the Association might go forward in a more relaxed and reconciling atmosphere.

As you will know if you have been reading the entries in this book in chronological order, Professor Harold Guite consented to serve as Acting President for the remainder of the term of office — for which I was vastly relieved and most grateful. Under his wise and excellent leadership, many of the rifts were healed, and by the time I began my presidency in May of 1979, I felt I was supported by a strong Executive who, while as usual not always in agreement, did support the decision in favour of the Joint Committee; even those who had opposed the idea of the Joint Committee worked hard to make it a success. And overall the Executive took its decisions in the light of what the members believed to be the best interests of the University.

What do I see as the main work and accomplishments of the Faculty Association in the year that I was its President? Answering that question and expressing my gratitude to some of the Executive members who especially stand out in my mind will take up the remainder of my comments.

The work of the Joint Committee was a major focus, not only for the three Faculty Association representatives to the Committee (myself, Professor David Winch, and Professor Harold Guite in Phase I), but for the Executive as well. A “Faculty Pre-Retirement Reduced Workload Policy” was agreed upon in the late fall, which allowed all faculty who had ten or more years of continuous full-time service with the University and who were age sixty or older, to reduce their workload as much as 50% and still receive full pension credits and benefit coverage until retirement — a modest, but concrete step toward developing policies to provide faculty with options which would also result in savings for the University outside faculty salaries. An early retirement policy which would be attractive to faculty and still achieve savings for the University had not reached a stage where the Administration could present a proposal; we were informed that one difficulty was drafting a policy which would conform to the requirements of the Department of National Revenue.

In view of the newly functioning Joint Committee and the financial position of the University, a new committee was formed by the Executive: The Remuneration Committee which was composed of the Chairman of the Salary Committee (Professor Alan Kay), the Chairman of the Pension and Benefits Committee (Professor Daphne Maurer) and the Chairman of the Financial Exigency Committee (Professor David Winch). The Financial Exigency Committee had been created the previous year, if my memory is correct, and was very active in developing ways for the University to achieve savings by providing faculty with options such as early retirement, leave of absence financed by installments, flexibility in teaching load, release of tenure obligation by early termination and pension adjustment, etc. The Remuneration Committee provided much advice and support to our representatives (myself, Professor Alan Kay, and Professor Steve Threlkeld) in Phase II of the Joint Committee, where the negotiations for faculty remuneration were carried out.

Agreement was again achieved that year between the Administration and Faculty Association representatives to Phase II of the Joint Committee on faculty remuneration; the Executive approved the agreement and recommended acceptance by the membership, and this recommendation was supported by a very large majority at the Annual General Meeting. The agreement included a 7.5% scale increase, A Career Progress/Merit component of 3%, and the Administration agreed for the first time to pay the full premiums for Major Medical Insurance — a tax free benefit when paid for

by the employer.

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Appointment Procedures was struck as a result of a case put before the Executive very early in my term. Basically a unanimous vote by an academic department for a particular appointment was overturned by the senior administration, and an individual considered by the department to be fourth in line was appointed. While there was some understanding of the department's outrage, and considerable support for their argument that this was not a collegial action, the fact was that the President of the University had the final authority on appointments, and no rules of procedure had been broken. Under the very able Chairmanship of Professor David Winch, procedures for new faculty appointments were developed which included an innovative procedure for dealing with those rare but especially troublesome cases where substantial disagreement continued to exist over an appointment after conflicting positions had been recognized and fully discussed. Even though this procedure imposed some limitation on the President's authority, it was nonetheless accepted by President Bourns.

The Tenure Committee had a busy year working on two appendices to the Appointment, Tenure and promotions document under the dedicated guidance of its Chairman, Professor Grant Smith. A revision of Appendix A would, if accepted by the membership, extend to all Faculties "full time special appointments" and "Continuing Appointments Without Annual Review" (CAWAR), which had so far been limited to the Faculty of Health Sciences. These categories of appointment applied to faculty whose salaries came from sources outside of the University. In my President's Report to the General Meeting of 22 April 1980, I said, "We did have some concern about the possible bad effects of too great a proliferation of such appointments, but believe that the inclusion in the Appendix of a statement that such appointments will be reported annually to Senate, coupled with vigilance by faculty and administration, should allow us to reap the benefits of such a policy while avoiding the potential danger." Work on a major revision to Appendix B concerned with tenure and promotion policy for part-time faculty had been completed, approved by the Executive, and sent to the Administration for consideration.

In the spring of 1980, at the request of President Bourns, we met with relevant members of the Administration to discuss events relating to negotiating the first Graduate Assistants Association (now the TA union) collective bargaining contract. We also met separately with the officers of the GAA at their request. They asked for, but did not receive, our support and encouragement. The viewpoint taken by the Executive and transmitted to the Administration was that the Association did not consider itself a party to the negotiations, but pointed out that we were concerned that no clause of the collective agreement should infringe on the traditional functioning of the University or the rights of Faculty.

It was during this period that the surplus in the Pension Fund was first identified and made known by the University, and the question of how it might be used was under discussion in the Pension Trust Committee. Our representative to this Committee was Professor Steve Link who tried, unsuccessfully, to get the Committee to defer until the fall, action on the transfer of surplus funds to offset the University's liability to the pension fund, pending full discussion in the Joint Committee.

There was extensive and intensive work in the area of pensions and benefits under the meticulous and diligent chairmanship of Professor Daphne Maurer. It was largely due to this committee's efforts that the Joint Committee agreed that a complete review of benefits would be carried out in 1980/81, with one main purpose being to devise ways of maximizing after-tax income. Our Pension and Benefits Committee did a thorough review of benefits during this year and recommendations relating to many of our benefits were endorsed by the Executive for transmission to the Joint Committee. In my annual report to the Membership in April 1980, I thanked Dr. Leslie King, the Vice-President (Academic), for responding with despatch and good humour to our constant barrage of requests for this information, rate quotations, projections, and calculations which such a review necessitated. The

concern for maximizing after-tax income led to some frank and open discussion in the Joint Committee this year, and to a very worthwhile meeting of several members of the Executive and members of our Pension & Benefits Committee with key people in the Administration, the Personnel Department, and tax and pension advisors to the University. At this meeting we made it clear that we wished to find and implement a cafeteria style approach to some benefits.

A new University policy, "Policy on Relations of Retired Faculty with the University", to which we had considerable input, came into being. This policy encouraged continuation in the intellectual and social life of the University. Retired faculty members would receive an ID card allowing full use of the library, bookstore, sports facilities, the Faculty Club, etc., either on the same basis as employed faculty or on a discounted basis. The policy also set out guidelines for the assignment of office and research space for retired faculty. In addition, the Association gained courtesy parking and free athletic privileges for spouses of retirees. Neither of these benefits is currently available; indeed, even for the retirees themselves, athletic privileges are no longer free.

A change to the wording of the Banking of Teaching Guidelines was achieved. This clarification in wording was expected to eliminate what had been a problem of disparate and inequitable interpretations of the guidelines by chairmen and deans in different Faculties.

Good progress was made in ensuring that henceforth the Faculty Association would receive coherent information about changes in faculty complement. The Vice-President (Academic) agreed to provide two relevant reports each year. The first, to be provided in the Spring, would give a statistical summary of changes in faculty complement based on decisions taken by April of the current year and to take effect in July. The second report would be provided in the Fall of each year, listing all new full-time faculty appointments made in the current academic year by name, category of appointment, and departmental affiliation.

The first report was received in April just before my term of office ended. You will recall that at the beginning of this manuscript I said that there was great concern about the special vulnerability of those faculty appointed on Contractually Limited Appointments. The massive cut we feared and worked so hard to avoid did not occur. Fifty CLAs came up for review in the Spring of 1980. Eight were converted to term appointments, one less than the year before; and a total of five contract positions were removed.

We were not successful in obtaining any changes to the pensions over the course of that year. However, recommendations were forwarded to the administrative body which would review pensions and benefits in the 1980/1981 year. These recommendations included equivalence between benefits under the old and current pension plans; first year pensions should be increased by the same amount as current pension benefits, and improvement of the pension plan using the pension fund surplus should be considered.

The Special Enquiries and Grievance Committee had a very heavy work load in this year that included a very lengthy and complex grievance as well as the task of formulating a policy on access to personal files. Professor Norman Jeeves was superb as chairman of this committee. I developed enormous respect for him: for his eloquence, his unflagging attention and seemingly tireless devotion to a largely thankless job, and above all for his integrity. I was very fortunate that he was willing to serve in this role, and I wish to express my deep gratitude.

I wish also to express special gratitude to two individuals on the Executive that year: Professor David Winch and Professor Harold Guite. Harold Guite as Past President was a model and mentor for me. He was always available to me and provided much appreciated advice and support. David Winch was my "right hand". He undertook with enthusiasm what to me were often onerous and/or daunting tasks, accomplishing them with speed and lucidity. He never asked for recognition for himself, and

always had in mind what would be best for the University.

All three of the men I have expressed individual gratitude were marked for their eloquence in very different ways. When I was growing up my Mother sometimes said that she was “plain vanilla” and I was “tutti frutti”. When I think of these men I **know** that I am “plain vanilla” and they are “Royal Golden Vanilla” (Jeeves), “Fabulous Pistachio” (Winch), and “Pralines and Cream” (Guite).

Alvin A. Lee

President Emeritus (Professor of English Emeritus)
1980-1990

Felicitations to the McMaster University Faculty Association on the Occasion of its 50th Anniversary

Throughout my forty-one years as a member of the McMaster University community, I have known the Faculty Association from within it as a member and from several vantage points outside it, the offices of Dean in the Graduate School, Vice-President Academic, President of the University, Chair of the Council of Ontario Universities, executive member of the board of directors of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, member of the Council of Commonwealth Universities, and now, since 1992, as President Emeritus. From each perspective, though there were rocky times, the Association has looked good and very necessary to the well-being of McMaster University.

It is long established that the faculty members of this University, one by one and in total, have won McMaster a secure place among the few most academically impressive universities in Canada, and prestige internationally, in the numerous fields in which we excel. Many factors are involved but I do believe that the collegiality model at McMaster — by which faculty members collectively, through the Association, work with the Administration in sharing responsibility for the whole University — is a strong contributing force. It helps further the overall thrust towards academic excellence and it is also a major political achievement in its own right, never perfectly realized but always there as an ideal central to the ongoing strength of McMaster.

I warmly congratulate the Association on its 50th anniversary and I wish it well in the years to come.

1980/1981

President: S. F. H. Threlkeld

April 16, 1981: The President's Report at the Annual General Meeting is reproduced below.

Being President of the Faculty Association for a year is a revealing experience, particularly for someone like myself who has in the past wondered about the usefulness of the Association. But then nearly all such experiences turn out to be quite different from the way one imagines them. We are all so full of prejudices. Having staunchly refused to join the Association for many years, and then mysteriously, as it were, to find myself President, I also feel as if I have been eavesdropping for the past twelve months.

Unfortunately, I have no scandals to report, perhaps they were kept well hidden from me. After all the Association does have a very competent Executive Assistant. I did sometimes get the impression that she was holding her breath in case I clumsily dropped her treasure and some pieces had to be glued together, or that I at least dented it. Perhaps the nearest I can get to a scandal is to tell you that some of your money is being spent on humbugs — Laura Secord's best humbugs in fact, available to sweeten the hours as your Executive deliberates on the problems of the day.

The results of my eavesdropping have confirmed to me that the Faculty Association is really a very important instrument in the affairs of this University. One of its concerns early in the year was directed at contractually limited appointments. We were all very anxious that the very good CLAs (and there were some very good ones) would be given the opportunity to remain at McMaster, that although the University had no formal commitment to *them*, it really had a moral commitment to *itself* to make sacrifices to keep these excellent people. To my knowledge none of these very good people has had to leave McMaster. Your Association had a little bit to do with that, through its input into the Faculty Association/Administration Joint Committee.

Up on the 4th floor at the back of Chester New Hall many hours are spent by your representatives on various committees. This University is most fortunate to have such dedicated people. One of the nice things about being President is that you can get other people to do all the work. I hesitate to name certain individuals for fear of excluding others who have served you so well. But I shall not hesitate for long. Alan Kay has served as Chairman of the Salary Committee for three years. This very important job requires a thorough background knowledge, both local and general, a capacity for persuasiveness, and a canniness that seems to come naturally to some nationalities, plus a willingness to give a great deal of personal time. The outcome³⁰ of this year's salary deliberations is testimony to Alan Kay's integrity, and his willingness to work so hard for others.

Another important committee this year has been the committee set up by the President of the University to review all benefits and the pension plan. Lynn Newbigging chairs the Association Pensions and Benefits Committee and, along with Jack Graham and Peter Macdonald, represents faculty on the Benefits Review Committee which has demanded a great deal of work from the representatives and perhaps a certain amount of optimism.

³⁰ATB of 10.1% plus 2.8% CP/M

I must mention David Winch who, apart from his unfortunate habit of trying to get the President (of the Faculty Association I should hasten to add) to do some work, has played a very important part in much of the Association's business throughout the year, giving of his time unstintingly. Although he may sometimes claim to be the token son-of-a-bitch on this, that, or the other committee, this has never been our experience. Quite the reverse: his thoughtfulness and concern for this University is exceptional.

The Tenure Committee has been carefully guided through the year by Grant Smith. Frank Jones, as OCUFA Director has worked hard to keep us informed of activities at OCUFA. And I should mention at least three others: David Barrett who has done the important work of keeping the Newsletter going, and Anna Whiteside who has been busy chairing the Committee on Access to Personal Files. And last but certainly not least, David Inman whose many duties have included Public Relations. It is David who keeps writing letters for me to sign and some of which, I must confess, I actually read. To all these, and others not mentioned, I extend my sincere thanks. The Executive has been a truly excellent one this year. They have served us all very well.

Besides the day to day chores handled by your Association through the year there are some major events that demand time and attention. One such event was the convening of a Committee, by the Minister of Colleges and Universities, to study the future of Ontario universities. Your Association together with OCUFA deplored the fact that neither OCUFA nor any body of the faculty of Ontario universities was asked to nominate members for the Committee. In forming the Committee, the government essentially ignored OCUFA. Be that as it may, what did please me was that this University sent the Committee a brief, a brief that was jointly composed and supported by the Association and the Administration. Although the brief itself was important, to me the most important point was that it was put together by the Administration and the Faculty Association, and, in being so, was a clear demonstration of collegiality at McMaster. The McMaster Faculty Association does not view itself as in an us vs. them situation with the Administration. Sometimes it may arise that there are different ways of looking at the same problem, but the unifying point is that our first and foremost concern is not the selfish one of our group to the exclusion of others, but rather to find the approach that will achieve the most good for the University as a whole. Currently, your Association and the Administration are working together on a response to the preliminary report recently received from the Minister's Committee.

We have another concern, which I am sure you will hear more of during the coming year. We have at McMaster some very good undergraduates and graduate students, ones who can be readily accepted as colleagues in debate, discussion and the exploration of new ideas, but we are becoming increasingly less enchanted with the small minority who do not seem to understand the meaning of a university. We need more people like Dean Berland to tell us clearly, over and over again, what a university is all about; we need such people to guard our values. One of the greatest concerns of Faculty at the present time is seen in our wish to attract more truly academically oriented students to our University: you cannot make silk purses out of sow's ears.

Again my sincere thanks to all those enthusiastic people who have helped the Association to achieve some of its goals this year, and my thanks to the officers of the Administration who have always responded thoughtfully and with concern to the problems of the Faculty Association. A very special vote of thanks to our Executive Assistant, Joan Field, and my very best wishes to the newly elected Executive.

David M. Winch

1981/1982

Looking Backward

I have been asked to reminisce about my presidency of MUFA, but I cannot do so properly other than in the context of the years that preceded and followed it. It all began for me in 1966 when I came to McMaster after nine years split among three other Canadian universities. McMaster was then a much smaller, gentler, more peaceful place. The sunken gardens lay tranquil where the Health Sciences building now stands, and the sites of many of our current edifices were open spaces. The nature of the employment “contract” was also very different from what we know today.

Appointments were made formally by the President, but effectively by the Department Chairman. It was clearly understood that although salary was spread over twelve months, one was committed for at most nine. From convocation to Labour Day faculty were free, as they were at other Canadian universities. Some retired to their summer homes to spend the summer reading and perhaps writing. Some chose to accept summer teaching contracts at their own universities or elsewhere. And some chose to supplement their incomes as consultants to industry or government. McMaster was just beginning a “summer research stipend” scheme, by which a faculty member who chose to devote the summer to research could apply for a stipend from the University to compensate for the sacrifice of alternative income opportunities.

The new pension plan took effect on the day of my appointment and I was far from happy to learn some of its provisions. So inadequate had been the previous pension plan that faculty members then retired or nearing retirement faced real poverty. The new plan boosted the pensions of those about to retire, but only at the expense of very poor provision for those who would leave after a few years service. Having had a somewhat peripatetic career to date, I was not happy with a scheme that would make moving on after a few years very expensive. I expressed my concerns and was co-opted to the Faculty Association Pension Committee. In my second year, I was chairman of it. Thus began a long association with pensions and with MUFA. One of my first tasks was to argue that the Board of Governors should provide funds to boost pensions of retired academics with at least twenty years service to a minimum of \$300 per month. The necessity to beg for charity for my predecessors persuaded me that henceforth faculty should bargain for rights and not plead for privileges or concessions. It is ironic that in the late sixties I began by complaining that I could not afford to resign, yet by the late eighties I should leave because it was not worth remaining the last ten years to normal retirement age.

I well remember my first MUFA meeting. I was perturbed to watch it proceed with many fewer than the required quorum of one-third of the membership present. On enquiry I learned that we had not had a quorum for years, yet the officers and the Executive were elected at the AGM. None of it was legal, but the quorum requirement could not be reduced because we could not get the quorum of one half of the membership needed to amend the constitution. The President and I had the next General Meeting stage managed. Notice of motion to change the quorum requirements had been given. He announced from the chair that he could see a quorum. His ruling was challenged from the floor and upheld by vote. The Faculty Association had upheld his opinion that he could see a quorum and the meeting proceeded to change the quorum rules. I believe we have operated legally ever since.

Term appointments had always been made by the University President, on the advice of the

Chairman in consultation with the Principal. Tenure and promotion were granted by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the President on the advice of the Chairman and Principal. The Faculty Association believed that faculty members should be judged by their peers, not their managers. After much debate and negotiation the Tenure and Promotion document was approved in 1970. It established the Faculty Tenure and Promotion committees and procedures for appeals and dismissals. It has been amended since and the interpretation of its provisions was subject to considerable evolution over the years as individual Faculties adopted “guidelines” that were often considered authoritative in governing the deliberations of Faculty Tenure and Promotion committees, although they have never had any official status. Several decisions made under them were overturned on appeal. Without the Tenure and Promotion document negotiated by the Faculty Association there might have been no provision for appeal.

While looking through old files of the period, I found the Second Interim Report to Senate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review Senate..., which I chaired. It was dated May 1973 and recommended the creation of an appeal committee of Senate as a standing committee, with two members from each Faculty and a chairman. The chairman would appoint three of the committee to hear each appeal. This would replace the creation of an *ad hoc* committee each time an appeal was filed. I understand that, over a quarter century later, that recommendation is at last being considered seriously.

I recall particularly the long debates that resulted in the wording adopted to describe the qualifications for tenure and promotion. Many faculty members here questioned the wisdom of the publish or perish mentality then sweeping many US universities. There was no dispute that research and publication are important functions of faculty and should be rewarded. The question was whether publication was a necessary condition for a legitimate career as a scholar and teacher. The McMaster compromise was to specify requirements for tenure and promotion very vaguely.

In the 1970 policy, “to qualify for tenure the individual shall have demonstrated academic excellence in his field....the Tenure Committee shall have regard, among other things, to scholarship as exemplified by teaching and research.” The requirements for promotion were not specified. In the 1977 revised policy a candidate for tenure had to have “demonstrated academic excellence...[and]...established expertise in one or more areas of his or her discipline and [to be] making the expertise known in the public domain where it is available for peer review.” It was envisaged that a faculty member might deliver a paper or two to his learned society or write a paper or two in his department’s working paper series and receive tenure. He might spend his entire career as Assistant Professor and be a valuable scholar and teacher. With no maximum salary for the rank, he could be adequately rewarded. For promotion to Associate Professor, however, the 1977 policy required “published scholarly work”. The collective opinion has changed over the years and the required amount of publication has increased.

I have always considered myself very fortunate in being one of the last of the generation of academics who could afford what I consider to be an important principle of professional ethics. I publish when I have something to say. I will not write simply because some document, committee or Dean tells me that I have to say something. My successors have been denied the luxury of such principles, or have at least found them very expensive.

In the late sixties my own Department was going through a period of rapid growth prior to the launching of our new PhD programme. Careful recruiting was vital to the future of the Department, and recruiting was essentially in the hands of the Chairman. The procedure for selecting his successors was therefore crucial. A small committee wrote, and the Department approved, a set of by-laws that have served us well for over thirty years. Central to them is the balloting process by which the Department’s nominees to fill vacancies are decided. The by-laws have no official status outside the Department, but our choice of Chairman has always been accepted by the University search committee.

It was not to be long, however, before the office of Chairman was emasculated. A new academic administrative structure was devised in 1967, with six Faculties in three Divisions. Six Deans and three Academic Vice-Presidents were appointed to replace two Principals. The only way to occupy them all was by duplication of, and encroachment on, the powers and responsibilities of Chairmen. Where a Chairman used to act, he now had to consult with one, two or even three others. With the exception of one Deanship, once, in the mid-seventies, the senior offices were not filled by election.

The process used to fill senior academic administrative vacancies was probably more important than anything else in persuading me to devote so much time over the years to MUFA. When a vacancy was about to arise, a “search” or “nominating” committee was carefully selected. In practice it was an appointments committee, for its recommendation was never rejected. Apart from the very few selected to serve on the committee, the faculty were totally excluded from the process of deciding who should be appointed. Submissions to the selection committee were invited, but the veil of secrecy behind which it operated was impenetrable. The outsider could not make a meaningful submission about the choice when he could discover nothing about the identities of those being considered or their qualifications. Eventually a single name was revealed to Senate and endorsed by a hasty vote taken before any senator could have second thoughts, or anyone else have a first thought.

That process was in marked contrast to the procedure used by Senate to discharge important business. If, for example, there was a proposal to divide Gastronomy IA6 into Gastronomy IA3 and Gastronomy IB3, senators would receive full documentation of the progress of the motion through Department and Faculty curriculum committees with a summary of the arguments for and against. The papers came two weeks before the Senate meeting so that senators would have ample time to consider the matter, confer with their colleagues, and consult their consciences before exercising their votes on a matter of such momentous import. But if we were merely appointing a University President an instant and perfunctory nod as and when directed was considered quite sufficient and more appropriate.

I have on many occasions agreed with University Presidents and others who make public pronouncements about the importance of a university education, not simply as job training, but as a process of developing the mind that pays off in mature judgement years later. When the University must choose a new President, Vice-President, etc., a crucial decision must be made that calls for just such experienced and mature judgement. On every such occasion during my twenty-three years as a Professor, I was essentially told that I had spent so much time in universities that my judgement was now so mature that my opinion would be worth less than that of an undergraduate student. I was never invited to serve on the committee and an undergraduate always was. So I carry no responsibility whatever for the senior academic administrators we have had.

When I became Chairman of my Department, five years after my appointment, I had to work with the academic administration. Matters such as recruiting, that five years earlier had been within the Chairman’s discretion, now became the subject of endless memos among Chairman, Dean, Vice-President, and sometimes President as I tried desperately to get somebody to exercise the discretion I no longer had, before it was too late. My only solace as low man on the totem pole in such disputes was that having been elected by my colleagues, I could document the confidence of more faculty members than any of the others.

Clearly the development of the University was going to depend crucially on the persons selected for senior administrative appointments. The selection process was not reassuring. I considered my own role and could think of only three possible responses. One was to accept my servile status, do as I was told and show gratitude for anything I received. The second was to recognize my status as an assembly-line worker, recognize administrators as managers, and help to organize a militant union that would bargain from the strength of the strike threat. Both these I rejected because I would not

accept that the scholars should be subservient in a community of scholars. Administrators may be useful as servants, but they are not acceptable as masters. This left the third option, which was to work to strengthen MUFA so as to achieve a countervailing force of elected officers who would confront the administration as necessary. The legal authority of the University President would be confronted by the legitimate authority of the MUFA President who enjoyed and could document the confidence of the faculty.

The need for a strong MUFA became increasingly apparent in the issues that emerged in the seventies. Real salaries declined year by year as the ATB fell short of the CPI. The University President decided to end the summer research stipend and use the funds for a one-time round of salary increases. The effect was only partially to restore real salary levels. Faculty had suffered some erosion of salaries and had lost their stipends. We had essentially been laid off in the summers, but it was believed that we had somehow sold our summers and were now on twelve-month contracts, available to teach summer and evening courses on load. After negotiation with MUFA, the load teaching document emerged. It guaranteed each faculty member three continuous months each year free from scheduled commitments, a maximum span of twelve hours on any teaching day and a minimum twelve-hour night. Those guarantees are still valid and can be violated only by agreement.

Although the Faculty Association performed a valuable role in negotiating conditions of employment in several dimensions, the annual round of salary negotiations was perhaps the most visible of its activities. As the Faculty Association developed in its early years pure paternalism gave way to collective supplication. Each year the Association team met the University President and Vice-President, explained what change in salaries the Association considered justified and learned what we were going to get. The University President took his proposals to the Board of Governors, which endorsed them. By the mid-seventies there was considerable dissatisfaction with this procedure. The more formal structure of the Joint Committee was introduced in 1978 with widespread promises of “collegiality”.

The terms of reference of the Joint Committee prescribed two phases. In Phase I, the Committee would receive all the necessary budgetary information, consider the issues of priorities to which they gave rise, and offer advice to the University President on the fiscal boundaries that would constrain the budget committee. Thus it appeared that the Faculty Association would really have some power to influence the University’s priorities in the allocation of its scarce resources. In Phase II the committee would be the forum for the negotiation of remuneration for the coming year. If agreement was reached, it would be taken to the Faculty Association for approval and the Board of Governors for adoption. If the parties failed to reach agreement, the final positions of the two Presidents would be reported to a general meeting of the Faculty Association and debated there. If the Faculty Association endorsed the University President’s proposal, it would go to the Board of Governors as being agreed. If not, the parties would resume negotiation in a last effort to reach agreement, failing which both positions would be presented to the Remuneration Committee of the Board of Governors.

The procedure by which an impasse would go to a general meeting for a vote was agreed to by both Presidents. The University President was convinced that, while the Faculty Association negotiating team might be unreasonable, the faculty as a whole would surely support the responsible proposals he would make as being in the best interest of the University. The Faculty Association happily agreed to a vote. Its President had recently received a vote of confidence through the ballot-box when he was elected, while the confidence of the faculty in the University President was no more than a presumption that had never been tested. The University President who agreed to the procedure never did face such a vote, for in the first two years of the Joint Committee agreement was reached and he then retired from the Presidency.

The third year, 1980-81, was with a new University President. It was my year as Vice-President of

MUFA. When negotiations began we were confronted with preliminary budget numbers that showed serious financial difficulties and a large projected deficit. We had no desire to compound the difficulties facing a new University President in his first year, nor to make the University's deficit worse. The Faculty Association agreed to an ATB increase of 10.1%. Once we had agreed, the budget numbers changed. The financial stringency eased and other employee groups of the University received considerably more generous settlements. Our attempt to reopen negotiations and our claims for a mid-year correction were both rejected. By the end of the year it transpired that the original budget that had been used to achieve our agreement had underestimated income by \$1,175,000 and over estimated the cost of faculty salaries by \$406,000.

One might expect that when real faculty salaries are reduced, even by agreement, because of a deficit forecast that proves to be false, the funds that materialize will either be available for retroactive salary corrections or be in the base for negotiations of the next year's salaries. But that is not the way McMaster worked. Despite the Joint Committee's right to receive budget information promptly, the improved financial circumstances were not revealed until after the new found money had been committed by the administration to other uses.

We entered negotiations in the 1981-82 year wiser, less gullible, and determined not to be duped again. The preliminary budget again forecast a deficit, but this time we were sceptical. The numbers were ill-defined, there was no provenance for broad aggregates and some numbers were of questionable validity. We sought redress for the previous year's experience as well as compensation for inflation for a total ATB of 14.6%. The modest nature of that claim became apparent when faculty at the University of Toronto were awarded 18.5% by arbitration. Our University President offered 11%. We did, however, achieve an agreement about procedure which included our right to be consulted promptly about the development of proposed budgets and changes therein, and the right to carry changes forward to the next year's negotiations. Those commitments by the University President were not subsequently honoured.

The other President and I placed our positions before a general meeting where they were debated. The vote supported the Faculty Association position by a 10:1 ratio. When the Presidents resumed negotiations the University President raised his offer to 11.5%, still well short of our 14.6% claim. We prepared an alternative budget; demonstrating that our claims could be afforded if other areas of the budget were constrained to the same extent as faculty. Both cases were taken to the Remunerations Committee of the Board of Governors, which accepted the University President's position. Our case was then taken to the Finance Committee and to the full Board of Governors. At all levels the University President's position was endorsed and 11.5% was imposed on us.

Our claim of 14.6% would have cost \$771,000 more than the imposed 11.5%. We maintained and demonstrated that it was affordable. By the end of the year the University had \$832,000 more than the administration had forecast. Our claim could have been afforded even without the offsetting adjustments that we had proposed. By the time we learned of the excess \$832,000 it had been spent on other things, without consultation, contrary to our agreement of a year earlier.

The events of the spring of 1982 also shed light on the importance of Phase I of the Joint Committee. In June the University President's Executive Committee prepared a four page insert for the *Courier* explaining the University budget. The lead article described the iterative process among President, Vice-President, Deans and administrative officers by which the budget was prepared. The budget is a statement of the University's priorities in the use of our scarce resources. At no stage was any faculty member, other than academic administrators, involved in any way. Phase I of the Joint Committee existed precisely for the purpose of discussing such issues and making recommendations. So significant was its impact on the process that it was not even deemed worthy of mention. The hours spent in Phase I were apparently wasted. The Administration's idea of collegiality, it appeared, extended to hearing the views of the elected representatives of the faculty, but not to heeding them.

The tactic of releasing information to the Faculty Association only when it was too late to do anything about it extended to more matters than the budget and salaries. The Joint Committee existed, among other things, to negotiate benefits. Yet when the University President decided to embark on a review of the entire range of benefits in the fall of 1980, he did not bring the matter to the Joint Committee. Nor did he propose the formation of an *Ad Hoc* Joint Committee. He appointed the President's Benefits Review Committee with no representation from the Faculty Association. It was bound by secrecy, met for over a year with professional help, and presented a major report that ranged across our benefits from the dental plan to the pension plan. Given his desire to take the recommendations to the Board of Governors urgently, the University President gave the Faculty Association two weeks to digest, comment on and propose improvements to a report that had taken his own committee over a year to prepare with professional help. There was a flurry of activity, we did succeed in getting some improvements agreed and took our remaining disagreements to the Remunerations Committee of the Board of Governors. It is an open question how much better we could have done had we been accorded our right to negotiate benefit changes from the outset.

By the end of my term as President we had established several things. We could discuss the University's affairs collegially and affably in Phase I of the Joint Committee, though such deliberations had no effect whatever on the emerging budget. I recalled only recently one example of such informal discussion. There was a real possibility at the time that the graduate student teaching assistants would "strike" to further their stipend negotiations. They were not then a union. The University President began a meeting of the Joint Committee by telling us about his advice from the University's solicitor. If there were such a stoppage and any staff members refused to work during it, the University would have the right to withhold their pay. He asked how the Faculty Association would react if the same sanction were applied to faculty. I replied that we had a relevant precedent. Only the previous month the office of the Vice-President Academic had been occupied by a group of protesting undergraduates. For three consecutive days the Vice-President failed to discharge his duties from his office because he respected an undergraduate demonstration. If the University had withheld three days of the Vice-President's salary, then it would appear only fair to apply the same penalty to any faculty member who respected a graduate student demonstration. There was a long hush before we moved to the agenda. I did not then expect that hush to last over fifteen years, but I gather that the question has been addressed in more detail by MUFA only recently.

In Phase II we negotiated salaries. If there was no agreement the two sides could present their cases to both superior bodies. But when the University President's case was rejected by the faculty by an overwhelming majority, it had little effect on him. And the Board of Governors was not inclined to be persuaded by reasoned argument and valid arithmetic. For two consecutive years we had argued that the University could afford substantially more than the Administration claimed. In each year, by the end of the year, we were proved right. And in each year the funds in question had already been used for other things before they were revealed.

MUFA was clearly knocking its head against a rubber wall. We could then do one of three things. We could accept the process of collective supplication and placidly express gratitude for whatever we were offered. We could form a certified union and bargain with the last resort of a strike threat. Or we could try to persuade the Board of Governors to agree to binding arbitration. How my successors succeeded in achieving the third I leave them to report. By the time that I left the University the spirit of collegiality had sunk so low that MUFA and the Board of Governors were fighting in court over the pension fund.

In February 1987, the University President's Committee on Flexible Retirement recommended opening a window in 1988 and 1989 for early retirement under very favourable conditions. My calculations, checked and rechecked, showed that the difference in my disposable income between working full-time for the next decade or relaxing in full-time leisure was approximately equal to the minimum wage. I had been told what I was worth and for once I did not dispute it or try to

negotiate. I did oppose the window plan because I saw it as grossly inequitable, potentially very expensive and not in the best interest of the University. But I was by then without any office or forum, my opposition was ineffective and the window was opened. I was defenestrated with the comforting reassurance that withdrawing my services ten years early did not deprive the University of anything to which it attached significant value.

1982/1983

President: P. L. Newbigging

April 22, 1983: The President's Report at the Annual General Meeting is reproduced in its entirety.

At an Annual General Meeting of this Association held on Thursday, April 13, 1978, two motions were passed that are of interest in the current context. The first was: *that the salary package proposed by the President of the University be rejected*; and the second: *that in view of the ineffectiveness of the present mode of negotiating faculty remuneration, the Faculty Association begin immediately negotiations with the administration of a "Toronto-style" procedure in matters of remuneration for 1978-79 and subsequent years*. Both motions were carried by large majorities.

The minutes of the meetings of the Executive subsequent to that AGM make interesting reading. The first step taken by the Executive in carrying out the directive from the membership was to set up a Committee to Examine Remuneration Negotiating Procedures. Over the next few weeks the Committee and the Executive as a whole met with the then President Bourns in attempts to resolve differences of opinion about what would constitute negotiating procedures acceptable to both the President of the University and to the Association. "Toronto-style" procedures, with their provisions for mediation in the event of disagreement, were rejected by the President as being, in effect, indistinguishable in important ways from certification. There was disagreement within the Executive itself about the most effective way of resolving the difficulties, disagreements running so deep that some members felt compelled to resign.

It was from this somewhat stormy background that the Joint Committee emerged. Precisely whose idea it was seems not to be a matter of record but there are recorded comments about what it was hoped, at least by some, it would achieve.

Prior to the formation of the Committee, faculty remuneration had been decided by a relatively informal process. The Association's salary brief, once approved by the membership, was presented to the President and discussed with him, typically by the Salary Committee Chairman and the Association President. The Salary Brief itself was put together with very little knowledge of the University's financial position. This made it difficult to argue that a proposed increase was indeed affordable and the President of the University could, and did, impose whatever settlement he felt was appropriate. The optimists among us, recognizing the chronic disparity between the faculty's proposed increase and the one awarded, were fond of saying, and perhaps believing, that while in a given year the salary brief had obviously little effect, none the less it probably had a positive influence over the long term.

What brought about the change in this benign atmosphere and led the Association to reject a somewhat monarchic arrangement? Perhaps it was that the erosion of faculty salaries that had been deepening over the six preceding years was becoming more obvious and the prospects of reversing it increasingly dim. Whatever the cause, it was clear in the Spring of 1978 that the faculty was unhappy with the existing arrangement and wanted a change. In looking to a "Toronto-style" mode of negotiation in the first instance there was the implied belief that a mediator from outside the institution would conclude that more generous salary settlements were possible than those awarded in the past.

In accepting the Joint Committee as an alternative to Toronto's arrangement the faculty voted for a collegial rather than an adversarial relationship between faculty and administration. The full name of the Committee —The Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee to Consider and Give Advice on University Financial and Related Matters — describes what it was hoped it would accomplish. In order to give advice on financial matters clearly the Faculty Association members of the Committee would need to be fully informed of the financial circumstances of the institution. By dividing the meetings of the Committee into two phases, provision was made for general discussion of the University's priorities and financial circumstances before, in the second phase, negotiating a salary settlement.

The Committee has now been in existence for five years and it is perhaps not premature to review briefly its history and to ask if it is fulfilling the functions for which it was created. Have salary settlements been reached on the basis of full understanding of the University's priorities and financial position on the part of the Association's representatives on the Committee? And has the faculty, through its representatives on the Committee, had a meaningful role in setting the University's priorities?

Of the first three years of the Committee's existence perhaps little need be said. In each of those years agreement on the salary settlement was indeed reached and the Committee was able to issue a report signed by all members in which a single recommendation was made to the membership of the Association and to the Board of Governors. It might be noted in passing, however, that in those three years faculty salaries declined precipitously, relative to the 1972 baseline, after a slower decline in the four previous years.

The last two years have seen less tranquility in the Committee. Last year after long discussions in the Joint Committee and after faculty representations to the Remuneration Committee, the Finance Committee, and then to the Board of Governors itself, a salary settlement was imposed that had been rejected overwhelmingly by a vote at the general meeting of this Association. It was the conclusion of the Association's representatives on the Joint Committee, a conclusion accepted by the faculty, that the settlement was less than the University could afford. After years of serious erosion in faculty salaries, a settlement less than what was affordable seemed to many to be unfair and, unnecessarily further the erosion. As it has turned out, the Association's representatives' analysis of ability to pay was substantially correct. An administration forecast deficit of \$361,000 for 1982-83 has turned out to be a surplus of \$471,000, a forecast error of over \$800,000, an amount which would easily have met the faculty's salary request. As you know from a recent issue of *The Courier*, the surplus has now been mostly spent; spent before any opportunity had been provided for the Joint Committee to consider its disposition, an opportunity that was required by the painfully formulated new terms of reference of that committee, terms of reference that this Association approved only last December.

What is the reason or reasons for these recent difficulties? It has been acknowledged that the Association's representatives on the Committee have not always been given full financial information and, when it has been given, not infrequently time has been too short for full comprehension prior to its going to the Finance Committee of the Board or to the Board itself. There is in those circumstances no realistic opportunity for any effective influence to be exerted by the Committee. Budgets and financial statements which account for a sum in excess of eight million dollars annually are necessarily complex and not easily analysed or understood.

The future of the Committee has been discussed in the Committee itself and in the Association's Executive. In those bodies there is optimism that the Committee can work,

that there is enough good will on both sides and a determination to remedy the deficiencies that have become apparent these last two years.

In discussion of the Committee's future the inevitable question arose: if not the Committee, then what? This question has arisen in meetings of this Association in the recent past and no satisfactory answer has been given. There is no generally acceptable alternative that anyone has so far been able to propose.

It seems to me that in these circumstances we should ask the new Executive, under the chairmanship of David Inman, to try again to achieve an effective Joint Committee. That Committee has the potential to provide for meaningful faculty participation in the administrative affairs of our University and, in my view, if we give up now we will be giving up too soon. I hope that you agree with me and will join me in offering your support to David and our new Executive in meeting this important challenge.

David Inman

1983/1984

A word of warning. Although this contribution begins (once these italics cease) in a frightfully jocular — some might say “coy” others, even more unkindly, “infantile”— vein, the mood changes rapidly from Panglossian to Pantagruelian. If happy memories of the good old days, when collegiality was the name of the game and harmony prevailed, are what you are looking for, you might like to consider skipping this one. D. I.

When I received a letter from Bernadette Lynn, back in November 2000, asking for my help in preparing a *Festschrift* for MUFA’s 50th Anniversary in 2001/02, I agreed without hesitation. There were several reasons for this impulsive acquiescence. The deadline of March 31, 2001 was comfortably far ahead; the brief was so broad that I foresaw no difficulty in cooking up something quite witty and riveting without a huge amount of cerebration or expenditure of time; the length specified — approximately ten pages (more or less)” — was comfortingly vague and intriguingly permissive of the pleonastic; although I didn’t really know what a *Festschrift* was — I am, after all, a barely literate biologist — I thought it might have something to do with a festive occasion involving the four common, common-room, capital “Bs” — Bonhomie, Back-slapping, Badinage and Beer.

No sooner had I sent back my light-heartedly affirmative reply, however, than I became aware that, as far as my time as President of MUFA was concerned, my mind was completely blank. I could recall absolutely nothing which had been said to or by me or anyone else during the year. Nor could I remember a singly teeny-weeny incident which had occurred. Not only that but — and this really began to alarm me — I could not even remember in which year I had been in office. I began to feel a bond with Coriolanus when he said:

*Like a dull actor,
I have forgot my part, and I am out,
Even to a full disgrace.*

Actually, that is not really entirely true. I just felt that a medium-rare slice of Shakespeare would not come amiss at this point. What I really felt was an absolute twit. All that white-hot angst, way back when, and not even a vestigial neuronal twitter to show for it in my geriatric memory banks. So this was it: Jacques’ seventh and final age:

*...second childishness and mere oblivion
Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything.*

It was a great relief, when I called the MUFA office and haltingly confessed the symptoms of my *tabula rasa* syndrome, to be told that they were being displayed by everyone else who had been approached. “No need to worry”, I was told, “the minutes of all the Executive and General Meetings during your year will be mailed to you at once. Which year was that, incidentally?” The reassuring voice faltered noticeably when I confessed that I couldn’t even remember which year I had dwelt half my life, mole-like, in the lower reaches of Hamilton Hall. The voice’s recovery was commendably rapid, however, and I was assured, in the tones normally reserved for deeply confused or semi-conscious patients, that the *temps perdu* in question had been 1983-84. Only seventeen years ago! How could my remembrance of what had taken place in that year be so totally absent? Now that

I have finished reading the minutes, I think I know the answer to that question. Re-reading them has been both an eye-opener and an opener of old and grievous wounds. As a result, disturbingly,

*...the plaintive numbers flow
For old, unhappy, far-off things,
And battles long ago*

At first, the task promised to be both interesting and pleasant. For one thing, the minutes had been meticulously recorded by Joan Field, the Association's Executive Assistant at the time, and I was reminded that Joan was one of the most intelligent, efficient and perceptive people I have ever had the pleasure to work with. And how could I have forgotten the dedication and commitment of a truly outstanding Executive Committee? The minutes of our early meetings convey a spirit of trust and hope for a new collegial approach which comes close to revivalism. A cultural affairs committee was struck. So was a committee dedicated to improving the status of women in the University community. Then came a motion, carried unanimously, to propose an increase in the mill rate to the membership for the express purpose of supporting intellectual activities, cultural activities and the production of a literary magazine — all for the benefit of the entire University community, not just the faculty. These early minutes suggest that not only did we believe there to be an increasingly bright light at the end of the collegial tunnel but that we were heading toward it at a spirited gallop.

As the year progressed, however, and the days shortened, so did our patience and eventually our tempers. Reading the minutes of Executive meetings in the fall of 1983 leaves me in no doubt that we were heading into a bitter winter of unanimous discontent as the Year of Orwell approached. With what were we discontented? In a word, *administrators*. Obviously that is my own view; but anyone reading the minutes must surely come to the same conclusion, I think. The number of cases requiring the attention and intervention of our Special Enquiries and Grievances Committee escalated. So did our differences of opinion and lack of trust not only with and in our own Administration but also with CAUT, OCUFA, provincial and federal governments and other administrative bodies. This mounting climate of disillusionment and distrust reached the force of a full storm and became sharply focussed on our totally unsuccessful attempts to negotiate with our own Administration in the Joint Committee. No matter what the issue — remuneration, career progress, pensions and a host of other money-related matters — any attempt to reach agreement resulted in an impasse.

By the end of December, all the Joint Committee had to show for its interminable and increasingly frosty meetings was an academic, but monumentally non-collegial, equivalent of the Berlin Wall — a structure which, in those days of universal extramural stand-off which we seemed to be mimicking intramurally, was still unbreached. Rather than attempting a tedious, stone-by-stone analysis of the squabbles and forays whereby this in-house barrier came to be erected, I will reproduce here, almost unabridged and only mildly edited, the minutes of a special general meeting of the Association held on 30 March, 1984 — that is, when the building of our private campus wall was virtually complete. The purpose of this meeting was to allow each member of the Joint Committee to give his (this is not a transgression of gender equality nomenclature; it just happens that, at that time, all the members of the Joint Committee were, in fact, male) view of how and why total stasis had been reached and then to allow the general membership of the Association to ask questions and air their views.

My purpose in reproducing these minutes is to make the reader aware of the reasons and attitudes behind the state of deadlock which had been reached. It is not my intention to criticize or laud the actions or views of individuals; to do so after a gap of seventeen years would not be only discourteous but pointless. With this in mind, and also to avoid any possibility of causing embarrassment or invoking litigation, I have replaced the names of the speakers with letters of the Greek alphabet (a nice academic touch, don't you think?). The only exception to these substitutions

of letters for men of letters is myself. I am now much too old to be embarrassed by past frailties and much too poor to engage in legal fisticuffs.



MINUTES OF A SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION
HELD ON FRIDAY, 30 MARCH 1984, 2:30 P.M. COUNCIL CHAMBER, GH III

PRESENT: At 2:35 when the meeting commenced there were about 127 members present. Approximately ten members joined the meeting subsequently.

CHAIRMAN: Professor David Inman, President

The Chairman informed the meeting that the procedures were being recorded and asked those wishing to speak to use the microphone nearest to them.

The Chairman declared that the meeting was closed to anyone other than members of the Association or members of the Joint Committee and Dr. Alpha, the Joint Committee Secretary. He said that the meeting had been called because the Joint Committee had failed to agree on a proposed recommendation to the Board of Governors on faculty remuneration for 1984-85. He asked that no motions be put until every member of the Joint Committee had had an opportunity to speak and declared that he wished, as a member of the Joint Committee, to present his views and would, therefore, turn the chair over to the Past-President.

CHAIRMAN: Professor BETA, Past-President of MUFA.

SUBMISSIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR INMAN (MUFA REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

Professor Inman declared that, in his view, the University is its Faculty and asked how the university — could show that it cared about its faculty. For many (possibly most) of the people present, this meeting was not about money as such; money was just a manifestation of a deep-seated statement, **recognition of worth**. He calculated, on the basis of a salary of \$40,000, that the difference in income per day between a 5% and a 6% rise in salary would be approximately \$0.78; but the preparedness of the administration to consider **any** figure higher than 5%, **as a statement of faculty worth**, was beyond price.

Professor Inman believed that the administration was not prepared to consider a total remuneration increase of more than 5%. He suggested there were only two possible reasons for their position: a) inability to pay and/or b) government restraint. He felt that it was up to the administration to prove the university's inability to pay more than 5%; but the fact that 5% was written into the only budget model presented to the Joint Committee in January suggested that such proof is unlikely to be attempted. Professor Inman reminded the meeting of the many promises in the Joint Committee minutes to "give high priority to faculty remuneration in its budgetary considerations" and in the mandate of its Terms of Reference to "the principle of redressing the erosion which has occurred in faculty salaries."

The only other possibility for the 5% figure being carved in stone was government restraint. The Inflation Restraint Act had, last year, legally limited faculty salary to 5%; however, its successor, Bill III, contained no such mandatory salary ceiling. Parties were not prevented by law from negotiating beyond the 5% recommended by the government and McMaster could make whatever salary adjustments it deemed appropriate.

If the administration's case for refusing to consider a figure higher than 5% was based solely on Bill III, Professor Inman observed that the welfare and self-esteem of faculty was being considered less important than pleasing the government: **any** acknowledgment of the worth and importance of faculty, **even if it were only 5.1%**, appeared to be out of the question.

Professor Inman closed his remarks with the hope that, when he was gone, it would be said that “he had taught as well as he was able, he had thought as well as he was able, and his efforts were respected and appreciated”, rather than “he was a government lackey who did his best to please, never caused a moment’s trouble, and nobody gave a damn”.

DR. GAMMA (ADMINISTRATION REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

Dr. Gamma remarked that blood-letting of the Administration in closed session had become an annual ritual of spring. He regretted that there had been an impasse in the Joint Committee in recent days but he and his colleagues thought it was clear why it had occurred. He said that he would make a brief statement about how he had fully adhered to the terms of reference of the Joint Committee, would talk about Bill 111, and would take the meeting through the overview of the budget for 1984-85 which had been distributed at the door.

On the first matter, Dr. Gamma said that there was more to the purpose of the Joint Committee than negotiation of a recommendation for remuneration to the Board of Governors. He felt that the Association members of the Committee had shown little interest in other matters. In response to Dr. Inman’s statement that budget information had been withheld and delayed, Dr. Gamma said that in less than two months an enormous amount of budgetary detail had been gathered and, realizing that Dr. Inman and his colleagues were seriously worried about not having the budget material that had gone before the President’s Budget Committee, it was agreed to accelerate getting material to the Joint Committee. The President’s Budget Committee got the material on Saturday morning and the Joint Committee members received it the following Monday: not a four day gap as suggested, but over a weekend. At the subsequent Joint Committee meeting it was clear that the Faculty Association representatives were not willing to discuss budget items. The 84-85 budget was not discussed in any thorough way in the Joint Committee, not because the Administration representatives were unwilling or negligent but because it was not thought appropriate by the Faculty Association representatives.

Dr. Gamma reported that there was limited discussion and no real disagreement about the policies and objectives of the Trust, Endowment, and Hooker Funds; he had made a recommendation to the Finance Committee of the Board which agreed to the policy to be followed on these matters. Later, he said, a motion was passed by the Faculty Association Executive directly in contravention of former discussions.

DR. DELTA (ADMINISTRATION REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

Dr. Delta expressed his deep disappointment at the tone and language of some of the communications recently sent out to faculty from the Association. He believed that they masked the main issue and served only to reopen old wounds. He rejected completely the implication that the Administration had acted in bad faith and contrary to the letter and spirit of the Joint Committee. Dr. Delta pointed out that in late fall one of the Faculty Association representatives, who had been a forceful contributor in discussions, had resigned from the Committee and had to be replaced.

Turning to the activities of the committee during the year, Dr. Delta said that he resented the fact that the Faculty Association representatives were bound delegates, bound to the wishes of the Association Executive, and said that it had not been the understanding of the Administration representatives when the terms of reference of the Committee were revised last year that the Executive would seek to interfere so directly into the workings of the Joint Committee.

He said that it was true that the flow of budget information had not always been as speedy as desired but, he reminded the meeting, preparing the budget is a time-consuming task involving many departments. The Administration representatives had believed that there was sufficient time, after the budget materials were put into the Joint Committee representatives’ hands, for a review of all the items.

Dr. Delta was of the opinion that both parties might be better served if there was a smaller group considering remuneration earlier in the year whose recommendations might then be put into salary deliberations later in the fall.

The major issue upon which the Joint Committee was divided this year, according to Dr. Delta, was whether or not positive action could be taken to improve faculty salaries and restore lost ground. The Administration perceived the political, social, and economic environment in which the University functions as demanding restraint this year, and were tailoring their actions accordingly.

Dr. Delta said that the administration's slogan was "5 until 85". The Faculty Association's "8 and don't hesitate".

DR. GAMMA

On the matter of Bill 111, the Public Sector Prices and Compensation Review Act, 1983, Dr. Gamma set out the Administration's position on the Bill. He said that Bill 111 described the second of two restraint periods; that its controls, although not all of them legally binding, exist during the period in question. The Inflation Restraint Board under the Bill has a mandate to review compensation changes in accordance with certain procedures. Transfer levels, which are the real teeth of the Bill, were set at 5% on the assumption that average compensation increases for any group would not exceed 5%.

Dr. Gamma informed the meeting that he and other public sector employers had met with the Provincial Treasurer, who had said if universities did not adhere to the suggested increase he would be back talking about "more violent means (his exact words) of control". Dr. Gamma said that from the administration's point of view one "more violent means" might be the effect on next year's grants; another might be line by line funding from the government. For these reasons, he said, the Administration representatives could not vote for the motion put by Dr. Inman at the last Joint Committee meeting.

Dr. Gamma said that he had seen no indication of any public sector settlements exceeding the 5% limit.

PROFESSOR EPSILON (MUFA REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

Professor Epsilon remarked that he had not recognized some of the things stated as having happened. One point he wished made clear was that, although Dr. Delta had made a remark about 8%, there never was a time when the Association had stated what it thought was a fair remuneration package: there was no room for negotiation if the Administration would not consider anything above 5%. Professor Epsilon felt that the implications of foot-dragging on the part of the Association representatives was unfair: he, himself, had been advised that he would get budget material over the weekend, had waited for it for 48 hours and it still had not appeared.

Another important point, according to Professor Epsilon, was the statement that the Hooker Fund policy had been agreed upon in the Joint Committee; he had no memory of any such agreement, and, in fact, the Association representatives had proposed that some of the Hooker funds be used to reward excellence in faculty members. Later, the Joint Committee was informed of the policy agreed to by the Board of Governors that salaries would be excluded from the use of Hooker funds.

PROFESSOR ZETA (FORMER MUFA REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

Following up Professor Epsilon's remarks about the Hooker policy, Professor Zeta stated that in his memory there was no consensus on the policy for use of Hooker monies. He could remember objecting vigorously, along with Professor Eta, that the Hooker Fund should not be excluded from being used for faculty salaries, and the next thing they knew was that the Board's policy was to exclude it. Subsequently, Professor Zeta had put a motion to the Executive, approved by an overwhelming vote, that the Hooker fund should be part of a formula for rewarding excellence in research or teaching each year.

On the question of good faith, Professor Zeta pointed to instances where the Administration representatives had failed to bring to the Joint Committee certain financial matters: i) the decision to sell University houses was not brought to the Joint Committee until after the decision had been taken; and, ii) decisions on Pension Plan improvements were taken by Board of Governors' committees without being tabled in the Joint Committee. Professor Zeta believed that the biggest example of bad faith on the part of the Administration was the failure to declare its position on the

recommended 5% limit to remuneration increases; the Association was led to believe that this issue could be discussed right up until the meeting at which division occurred.

Professor Zeta said that he had resigned from the Joint Committee because he was not satisfied with the way things were going; he felt that his own colleagues were being too conciliatory and too modest. In his opinion, his colleagues did not want animosity or accusations but resolutions in the best interest of the University. He felt that the fact that they had been so moderate and conciliatory was an indication of the severity of the breach that currently existed.

In response to the President's statement that there were no settlements above 5%, Professor Zeta quoted the three-year agreement at Carleton University for an 8% increase; the increase of medical doctors well above 5%; and the Pension Plan improvement for 120,000 Ontario teachers at an increased cost of 15%.

DR. THETA (ADMINISTRATION REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

As a new member to the Committee this year, Dr. Theta was disappointed in the Committee as a manifestation of collegiality, both in spirit and accomplishment. He wondered whether the Joint Committee could be anything more than a forum for the bargaining of salaries. He said that as a consequence of the Administration's acceptance of the 5% limitation, money was available to support the efforts of faculty in many ways: new faculty appointments in areas where they are badly needed, redress of the staff/student ratio, a modest increase in support staff, and reasonable amounts for equipment and libraries. Dr. Theta said that, in a year when political realities dictate adherence to the guidelines, use of money for those purposes was an indication of support of the academic priorities by the Administration.

DR. GAMMA

In support of Dr. Theta's position, Dr. Gamma declared that he thought it would be politically foolhardy for McMaster University to increase remuneration beyond 5% and that the benefit from not doing so was the possibility of arresting erosion in those areas outlined by Dr. Theta. He considered it more tolerable to adhere to the government guidelines because valuable and important things could be done with the cash that was freed.

In conclusion, Dr. Gamma said that although he thought it was deplorable that he could not give faculty and staff, whom he valued highly as colleagues and academics, higher than 5% remuneration increases, he thought he could use the money that was freed by that decision to do things that would make academic life for faculty and students somewhat less miserable. He said that he was not a lackey of the Ontario government: he had criticized policy makers in the cabinet more than anyone present. He believed that a submission he, Mr. IOTA and Dr. KAPPA had made to the Treasurer was influential in the decision to give 6.5% formula funding this year.

PROFESSOR INMAN

Professor Inman reported some of the figures being negotiated at other Ontario universities: King's College settlement of 5.98%; Toronto negotiations for restoration, CPI, and merit, plus benefits and pension improvements; Waterloo negotiations for 5% ATB plus 2-3% for merit; Western negotiations for 5.10 ATB plus merit, profile restoration and pension improvements.

MOTION: Professor INMAN / Professor ETA

- I THAT NEGOTIATIONS LEADING TO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY REMUNERATION FOR 1984-85 SHALL NOT BE CONSTRAINED BY A PRE-DETERMINED UPPER LIMIT OF 5%;
- II THAT FINAL BUDGET DECISIONS NOT BE TAKEN UNTIL SALARY NEGOTIATIONS ARE COMPLETE

DISCUSSION

Professor LAMBDA said that there appeared to be a point of law which he would like to address: was the University bound by a 5% ceiling? On that issue the parties did not appear to agree. Professor Lambda pointed out that Bill 179 was a control measure which had expired; Bill 111 was a restraint measure which, as Dr. Gamma agreed, is not legally binding. He had said that he would consider it inexpedient politically to violate the wishes of the Provincial Treasurer; that is debatable and should be debated in the Joint Committee.

Professor MU said that the issue was a simple one of money; he did not feel embarrassed asking for more money and he did not think the Administration should be embarrassed by the surplus in last year's budget or by the fact that there is a fair amount of money. He felt that faculty had been given far less serious consideration by the administration than faculty had given to University interests; they were again being asked to subsidize the University. He agreed that a great deal of restraint had been shown by the Association members in the Joint Committee meetings and felt there was a clear rationale for the Association position which he was willing to accept because it was in the spirit of restraint and would not put the University in dire financial straits.

Professor XI said that he was disappointed to have to wait until this meeting for it to be made clear that there is no legal restraint of 5% on faculty salaries; it was made abundantly clear when the administration spoke of the undesirability of offending the government. He believed this question should have been decided in the Joint Committee. Although he had, in the past, favoured restraint, Professor Xi said that when the Provincial Treasurer threatens him with violent means he is very much less in favour of restraint. In his opinion there ought to have been, in the Joint Committee, a thorough discussion of the consequences of failing to accept the Provincial Treasurer's advice. Professor Xi said he did not like to be threatened by the Provincial Treasurer and one did not win respect or sympathy from the Ontario government by giving way to them in this manner.

Further discussion included an appeal from Dean OMICRON to consider the social context of the University within the community, the unemployment rate in the community and the fact that no one in the professoriate had been equally devastated. Professor MU responded to this by pointing out that in the 70's the professoriate consistently got less than the private sector resulting in a 30% shortfall over the past decade.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED. THE VOTE WAS TAKEN
CARRIED: 130 in favour; 1 opposed; 1 abstention

FURTHER DISCUSSION

Professor Lambda pursued the issue of lack of confidence of faculty in the senior administration of the University. He reviewed the history of failure to produce information to the Joint Committee and the motion of indignation which had been passed at the last Annual General Meeting. He felt that the question of confidence should not be deliberated until the Joint Committee had discussed the clear message of this meeting that there are no binding controls, only morally suasive guidelines. He hoped that the Joint Committee would do its job and come back to the membership with an agreed statement that would be able to resolve any questions about confidence in the Administration.

The other issue followed up by Professor Lambda was the verbal introduction by Dr. Gamma of carefully selected items from the proposed budget for the coming year. He asked Dr. Gamma, "in the spirit of openness and collegiality", to let him have a copy of the budget to enable him to ask questions about it at this meeting. Dr. Gamma replied that he did not have a copy with him.

The discussion continued with the points of view of many of the members being expressed.

THE MEETING THEN ADJOURNED.



I realize that the foregoing reads like a satire which, if written with more style, could have stemmed from the pen of either Jonathan Swift or that of Charles Dodgson. But I assure you that I have done very little editing except to conceal the names of the *dramatis personae* in order to save them embarrassment — an embarrassment which would have been entirely justified, I feel!

Following this unprecedented, acrimonious but totally unproductive meeting, there took place a flurry of high pressure Executive and General Meetings at which a bewildering number of motions — many of them tri-, and some even quadri-, partite were proposed, amended, withdrawn, tabled, occasionally put to the vote, sometimes carried and sometimes defeated. Looking at them now, I find myself to be mightily confused about who was trying to do what to whom, and why; and I cannot but wonder whether I might not have been equally so at the time all this frenetic committeeism was taking place. Among the motions which were put and carried were the following:

That the Association seek the agreement of the Board of Governors to the establishment of binding arbitration on matters of remuneration which cannot be resolved by the Joint Committee.

Failing such agreement, the executive of the Association shall consider the appropriateness of determining the willingness of the membership to proceed to certification.

That the McMaster University Faculty has lost confidence in the ability of the chief executive officer to administer the university in keeping with the terms of reference of the Joint Committee.

...and so on — there were many, many more! All of them full of sound and fury at the time, no doubt, but with a significance which has diminished to about base-line level with the passage of time.

The outcome of all this moving and shaking was a meeting with the Board of Governors at which a number of propositions and concerns were passionately put forward, yet more motions aired and debated, and — as I remember it — several tempers lost. But this meeting took place after my term as President of MUFA had ended; so, coward that I am, I will leave it to my successor to report on what happened there and what, if any, effect it had.

Something of what I felt at the time comes back to me on reading my President's Report at the Annual General Meeting on 12 April, 1984. Here is an excerpt from what I said on that occasion:

I want to thank the members of my executive who have given me concurrence, criticism, courage, caution and comfort, and my executive assistant, Joan Field, for her continuous support.

The purpose of the Association, as I see it, is to promote the principle of academic freedom and the interest and welfare of faculty, supporting the principle that faculty should play an active role in university governance. The efficient running of a university is dependent on its administration; its immediate reputation is dependent on the quality of its teaching and scholarship; its future reputation is dependent on its graduates; but its *spirit* must, in the final analysis, depend on its faculty. I had intended to involve the Association in a variety of new ventures whose purpose was to enhance the intellectual climate, to relieve gloom and despondency with optimism, and to increase the McMaster community's awareness of the intrinsic value of "a university", and to strengthen belief in its own worth.

To quote James Russell Lowell:

“...there's nothing we read of in torture's inventions
Like a well-meaning dance, with the best of intentions.”

Of course, I am somewhat disillusioned! Some of these brave ships were launched; not all of them foundered. Thanks to the resource, vision and tenacity of its editor, Professor Graham Roebuck, “Ta

Panta”, the Association’s magazine for the McMaster community, was published in the fall of 1983; a second edition is expected hourly. Professor Gerry Field and his Special Enquiries and Grievances Committee have been fully extended handling a mounting tide of applicants. Some success has been achieved in improving Student/Faculty Liaison and it is not for want of initiative and effort on the part of Professors Al Berland and Spiro Panagiotou that their attempts to promote a series of cultural and academic happenings, with invited speakers, have failed to attract more than a handful of faculty.

With reference to the activities of the Joint Committee, a hope long deferred was that the faculty and the administration of the University could “work together with equal power and authority toward a common aim” — in other words, collegiality. As things are at present, they can’t — they never have and they never will — unless some changes are made. None of the conditions which define collegiality are really there: the aim is not always common; the power and authority are obviously not equal — on one side there is the McMaster University Act, on the other side there is nothing. And “nothing can come of nothing”. The only possibility, in my mind, is agreement between the Association and the Board of Governors to binding arbitration on matters which cannot be resolved by the current “collegial” process.

A much less guarded confession of how I felt about the way things had gone — or, more correctly, **not** gone — during my year as President was expressed in a piece which I wrote for the first issue of *Ta Panta*, the literary magazine which we had been successful in launching during the year (it floated for a while after that but inevitably sank without a trace — or, as I remember it, very much hullabaloo — a year or two later.)³¹

At the risk of exceeding my allotted space and the patience of any readers who have had the tenacity to stay with me thus far, I am going to reproduce that piece here because it sums up not only how I felt then but — as I have discovered, very disturbingly, on reading it again — even more accurately how I feel now.

▼
THE CLOISTERS AND THE HEART
(An Elegy without Rhyme but with Reason)
by
David Inman

If any one of my children is ever able to take enough time out from acquiring more, and more, and more expensive education to devote some to fundamental things, I may become a grandfather. Surely I will be old enough by then to sit in the sun and be played around instead of being played around with. When that golden old-age finally arrives, and I have time and toddlers on my gnarled hands, the following dialogue is possible.

The Mewler and Puker: “What did you do before you grew old enough to live on welfare, grandpapa?”

The Slipped Pantaloons: “Well, m’boy, I spent nearly fifty years of my life in a University.”

M and P: “Why?”

SP: “Eh?”

M and P: “WHY?”

SP: ‘OK, OK, I’m not that deaf yet. It’s just that no one ever asked me such a ridiculously naive question before.’”

³¹*Ta Panta* ceased publication in the Fall of 1993, ed.

M and P: “So answer it.”

SP: (after a long, embarrassed silence)

“Because I wanted to learn, and teach, and research, and search for the ultimate truth, and expand horizons, and push back barriers, and extend frontiers, and help to fan the embers of a rapidly cooling corporate intellect, and try to fill my head so full with matters of eternal, fundamental, archetypal, primeval, basic importance that there would be no room left for nukes, or pukers, or other transient things that go bump in the night, or for the certain knowledge that the twilight of our civilization is so far into the last handful of photons before the return of the Dark Ages — any one of which, though obviously of secondary importance on a cosmic scale, would be quite capable of keeping the mind in a state of “permanent boggle if it were not occupied with higher things like —“

M and P: “Jesus Christ, grandpapa!”

SP: “You’re quite right, I forgot to include that whole business — I always meant to do something about it, but it never got high enough on the agenda to be dealt with before the time came for a cortical adjournment — heh! heh! heh!”

M and P: “What was that last bit again?”

SP: “That was meant to be a reflective, sardonic chuckle but it turned emphysematous on me.”

M and P: “I guess you must feel a wonderful, warm inner glow about having dedicated your time and energy, and health, and family integrity, and all that jazz to such a worthwhile career. The rewards must enrich your declining years immensely and fill your, admittedly senile, cup of happy memories to the brim.”

SP: “Where did you learn all that crap? You haven’t even got a degree!”

M and P: “I found some of your old lecture notes. Seriously, though, before your last remaining neuronal circuits grind to a halt, tell me — what did you gain? What did you give? What did it all amount to in the end?”

SP: “Shut the door.”

M and P: “Why?”

SP: “Shut the Goddam door! Blood — not mine, perhaps, but yours — is thicker than water and I owe you an honest reply. But I don’t want to be overheard and accurately quoted, for the first time in my life, at my age — it’s that sort of thing that leads to cardiovascular accidents.”

M and P: “It’s shut; so shoot.”

SP: “The answer to your tripartite question, sonny, is nothing, NO THING, zilch, zip, zero-squared, the abhorred vacuum, the yawning void, absolutely and resoundingly DAMN-ALL.”

M and P: “Then why did you work in a university instead of doing something useful and meaningful, like being a parking-meter attendant?”

SP: “Because it seemed like a good idea at the time.”

After which telling riposte, I see myself swanning gracefully into the sans everything stage to avoid having to answer further embarrassing questions.

All of which, if you are still with me, spewed out while I was thinking how to begin writing this in such a way that I could reach a happy ending. But whimsy has not helped me; so I must give up on groping and wallow happily and cathartically in my own disillusionment in the hope that it may cleanse the system, even if it doesn’t

restore the spirit. Perhaps, if I shoot a swift dose of self-indulgent, intellectual morphine in public it will ease the passage; it may even dull the pain. Actually, you know, I really believe I feel a mite healthier already; anticipation is so much better than constipation.

The first rule says ‘always begin in the middle’; the second — if you want to come across a true-blue, up to the unforgiving minute, down-to-earth, latter-half-of-the-century (but aware of the glories of the past), coffee-spoon-measuring, trouser-rolling academic dodderer — says ‘always begin with Eliot!’ The Waste Land would, perhaps, be too ostentatiously appropriate for the state we have got ourselves into; but Prufrock might serve. After all, this is a love-song, however discordant and unrequited. Even an attendant lord — for such I am, and am happy to be — has the right to gripe. So, turning toward the window and settling a pillow by my head, I tell you, with the pent-up bile of half a life-time.

**“That is not what I meant at all.
That is not it at all.”**

I fought like hell to go to ‘the university’. They — the admirable, warm, human people among whom I had been raised — all thought that I was out of my mind. They were too polite and modest to say so, of course, but there was no doubt in my mind what was passing through theirs. What has gone wrong between then and now to prove that they were right? Is it a change in the academic *milieu* which I craved? The heart has grown sick, either in me or it. I think — I know — that the malady is not in me so, unless I have overlooked something, it must be in it — ‘it’ being the whole concept of what a university meant to me then, and could mean now.

Need I remind you that, in 1852, John Henry Newman said:

A university is, according to the usual designation, an *alma mater* knowing her children one by one, not a foundry, or a mint, or a treadmill.

With what exquisite care the man chose his words. Thirty years later, but still in the nineteenth century, Thomas Henry Huxley, writing to Lankester, said:

The medieval university looked backwards; it professed to be a storehouse of old knowledge....The modern university looks forward, and is a factory of new knowledge.

But that was in another Country; and besides, the Wench is dead — or, if not dead, then so mortally sick that heroic measures are needed if we are to avoid an irreversible morbidity which is now so close that you can smell it — if you have the time or courage to sniff the air. The university of today has indeed become a foundry, and a mint, and a treadmill. It is not the *alma mater*, the bounteous mother, which Newman fought for with such luminous hope and fervour. If it’s mothers you’re looking for, *stabat mater dolorosa* might be more appropriate — motionless and full of grief. Huxley was right in his vision; the medieval university looked backwards and — by saying with an arrogance as attractive as it was stultifying that we have all we want, there is no need for us to consider anything new, nor do we have room in the store for any more irrelevant clutter — was an unproductive ninety years ago as it would be today. But when that master-builder of the whole structure of liberal education urged universities to look forward he meant away into the far distance, to the horizon and beyond, not a few months ahead to the time of the next government funding announcement or to the time when your research grant runs out; and his currency was knowledge, not cash in hand. We, the Orwellian universities, have certainly fulfilled one of his ideals; we have become factories — but not, God help us, in the sense that Huxley meant the word to be interpreted.

What has gone wrong? Virtually everything; but the root cause is that the University has become a business enterprise which has lost sight of its mandate. The principal aim of any business is to make money — or, at the very least, to make sure that the books balance at the end of each year. If a business is small, autonomous, with clearly defined objectives, it can remain financially sound whilst pleasing its customers and earning the dedication of its staff and the admiration of others, whether they be competitors or the public. Such a business operation can succeed if everyone connected with it — those who serve it, those whom it serves, and those who observe it — never lose sight of its reason for existing. But when a small business turns into a big business the components are likely to achieve topsy-turvydom. The reason for being becomes “the

business” itself, not what the business does. It is at this point that a corporate enterprise is likely to build a fortified retreat — a glass and steel, forty-floor, downtown erection for example. This building, and the proliferative, inward-looking, administrative staff which it guards becomes the business. Secure in this fortress, the imperial guard assume an identity totally divorced from the original mandate which put them there — the customers, the wrinkled auld retainers, and the watchers from outside become the enemy; they are getting in the way of “the business”. This can go on for years, of course, and the point of departure can easily be forgotten. This process of forgetting becomes easier as the old fuddy-duddies retire, lose heart, die, and after a generation or two of the ebullient, young brigade, anyone who mentions — or even remembers — the point of the whole shebang is either tolerated with a civil leer, as being completely out-of-touch, or is derided to the point where retirement or death, or loss of heart are the only alternatives.

This is a vivid example of total topsy-turvydom; it has happened in the present day university. Four sub-groups make up a university community; students, faculty, support staff, and administration. What do these people do? The students learn — facts, concepts, ideas, how to learn, how to think, how other people think, what intellectual processes are all about. The faculty teach, and learn, and pursue their ideas in a process which we call scholarship, and act as role models, and serve as a source of inspiration. The support staff, as their name suggests, support the activities of the students and the faculty. They type things, and send messages, and move things, and plant things, and set things up. The administration makes sure that the students, and the faculty, and the support staff can go about the business which the university is there to conduct. It should be obvious, therefore, that the administration of a university — or of any other corporate enterprise with a stated purpose — *is there to serve*.

In my salad days, I worked for a great man; a celebrity, a scholar, a thinker, and a gentleman. As well as being my hero — which, though long dead, he still is — he was also the chairman of my department. Very little of the advice which I have received in my life-time has proved to be useful; most of that which has was given by this remarkable man. I recall, vividly, his rules of conduct for the academic dealing with the university administration. They were:

You must kick administrators whenever you get a chance. This is not an act of retribution, or revenge, or resentment, but a reminder that they are there to serve you and your students. It may hurt you more than it hurts them, they may individually be jolly fine chaps; you can try to explain it afterwards over a beer; but you must do it. If you don't, they will think you and the students are there to serve them, whereas they are there to serve everyone else; they are the employees, you are the university.

The reason why “The University” is now synonymous with the administration is because not enough kicking has been done. The University is its faculty and its students, in which ever order you like; its administrators are hired hands.

When enough big businesses of like kind have been established and, collectively, have the possibility of popular appeal, the state is likely to take control. Consumption then gives way to the Black Death. Destruction from without is faster and surer than petrification from within. The rot sets in, and, paradoxically, this is more effective if the system of government is democratic. As James Fennimore Cooper said, “the tendency of democracies is, in all things, to mediocrity”. That is where we, the universities, are now; beset by the internal topsy-turvyness of administration being an end in itself and the external imposition of mediocrity sicklied o'er with invidious phrases like “formula funding”, “selective autonomy”, “universal accessibility” and so on, *ad nauseam*.

What is the answer to the dilemma in which we find ourselves? I am prepared to fight to the death but, honestly, I don't know. I told you I couldn't work out a happy ending. I think that, in the unlikely event of a sudden recognition by those who matter that quality has given way to quantity, and that if we are prepared to do something about it we have the whip hand, the malaise is still treatable. But, meanwhile, I see nothing to suggest that we will not decide, with averted gaze, that this is as we like it, carolling dolefully.

**And therefore take the present time
With a hey, and a ho, and a hey nonino**

after which, like Touchstone, we will say

**...though there was no great matter in the ditty,
yet the note was very untuneable.**



As I said earlier, I think I now know why my memory of all that happened in the acrimonious spring of 1984 had been almost totally expunged. It had not been a pleasant experience and was undeniably one well worth forgetting. Not the least of the many unpleasant things about it, of which I would have preferred not to have been reminded, was the feeling of personal failure. Could I, as President of MUFA, have averted, or at the very least blunted a little, the widespread feelings of frustration and resentment with which my year ended? I think, in retrospect, that perhaps I could have done so if my political skills had been greater and my attitude at the outset slightly less like that of Dr. Pangloss.

No, not a pleasant piece — but I did try to warn you at the beginning that it would not be. To have written anything less unpleasant would have been dishonest. I am still in two minds about sending it to the Association Office. Would it not be better, after all this time, to just let the shenanigans and pomposities of my year as President remain buried in the drawers of filing cabinets? I shall have to think about this! D. I.

Don Dawson

1984/1985

My ascension to the Presidency of the Faculty Association was certainly serendipitous. On a Spring day in 1983, David Inman approached me at the Faculty Club and asked if I would run for the office of Vice-President. Being in a gregarious mood and certainly not knowing at the time that electoral success would automatically raise me to the Presidency in the following year, I accepted. The electorate spoke and, soon after, I was thrust into what can only be called “interesting times”.

During my term as Vice-President, I experienced, first hand, the tumultuous “Inman Year” in which a salary agreement was foisted upon the Faculty and the President of the University was censured. The other event that sticks in my mind from that time was the raucous, best ever attended (in my experience), Faculty Association meeting at which the current President of the University (then a Dean) raised the collective vocal ire of the attendees with his analysis of the economics of education and the salary process.

What I inherited was a situation in which there was no trust on the part of faculty in the method of salary determination. What to do?

In March of 1984, David Blewett, as Chairman of the *ad hoc* Committee to Consider Alternatives, had presented a preliminary report to the Executive of the Association recommending that a representation be made to the Board of Governors to “explore the desirability of binding arbitration as the only fair means of resolving disputes in the Joint Administration Faculty Association Committee to Consider and Give Advice on University Financial and Related Matters (hereafter the Joint Committee). (A final report making the same recommendation was submitted and enthusiastically accepted by the Executive on June 21.)

A presentation was made to the Board on May 2, 1984 by Alan Kay, David Inman and Joe Rose. It gave an overview of the extent of salary erosion and the state of faculty morale, and it made a strong case for arbitration. In response, directly after the presentation, President Lee gave a rather lengthy and intemperate speech in which he criticized the Faculty Association’s contributions in the Joint Committee and specifically impugned the capabilities of one of the Association’s representatives on the Committee.

In light of this negative attitude of the President, there was serious discussion in the Executive as to whether we should continue to participate in the Joint Committee. It was finally decided that since the Joint Committee dealt with more than remuneration we should not withdraw, and Jean Jones, the new Vice-President of the Association, Bill Carment and Bob Piercy, members of the Executive, joined me for yet another foray into “collegial” discussions.

In an attempt to keep a dialogue going and to apprise the Chair of the Board of Governors (Doug Marrs) of the faculty’s concerns, I met with him and President Lee in late May. At this meeting it became clear that Mr. Marrs was firmly supportive of President Lee and was concerned that the imbroglio was becoming more and more public and could affect fund raising. In what I considered to be a thinly veiled attempt at co-option, I was told that I had a chance to “make history” at McMaster. I assumed that this meant “to get along, go along”. For my part, I opined that the Administration was being too tightly controlled by the purse strings of the provincial treasurer and pressed for the initiation of an arbitration process.

In an attempt to keep the information process going, on June 7, Jean Jones, Bob Piercy and I made a presentation to the Remuneration Committee of the Board.

The summer wore on and nothing was heard from the Board. In the meantime, the Joint Committee was in intermittent, desultory, meetings which concerned such topics as repairing the running track and locating a helicopter landing pad for hospital emergency services.

In yet another attempt to advance some meaningful dialogue, I met once again with Mr. Marrs and President Lee and put forward, yet again, the suggestion that perhaps an arbitration process could be put in place for a trial period of two years. Somewhat to my surprise, Mr. Marrs informed me that the topic of arbitration would be discussed at the September meeting of the Board. Indeed it was, and although the Remuneration Committee recommended against binding arbitration, it recommended and the Board resolved to establish a committee composed of representatives of the Faculty Association, the Administration and the Board to study “the question of impasse resolution and report back to the Board at the earliest possible date”. A possible breakthrough! My Executive met quickly after this Board action to discuss its implications. Concerns were raised that it might be just a stalling tactic. After much discussion, it was decided to send representatives to the Board committee but at the same time it was also decided to “set in motion steps necessary for consideration of certification”.

The so-called Tripartite Committee was chaired by Peter Gordon who was then the Vice-Chairman of the Board. The other members were John Shephard, the Chairman of the Remuneration Committee of the Board, Deans Peter George and Ron Childs representing the Administration and Jean Jones and Gerry King representing the Association. The Committee was given a reporting deadline of the December 5 meeting of the Board and set to intensive work forthwith. The Joint Committee also stirred from its summer doldrums and started discussing more substantive issues such as tax relief for those on research leaves, maternity leave regulations, load teaching policy, age of retirement and the operating budget.

At the December meeting of the Board, the Tripartite Committee recommended a process of negotiation which had as its final step “final offer arbitration”. This recommendation was accepted by the Board and was immediately endorsed by the Executive of the Association.

In his report to the Association on the work and recommendations of the Tripartite Committee, Gerry King noted that a number of factors had come into play which led to this turn of events. First, David Inman’s initiatives made the Board aware of the nature of the problems festering in the relationships between the faculty and the Administration. Second, the fact that Peter Gordon was ascending to the Chairmanship of the Board brought in a new perspective in the matter of negotiations. Third, the Administration’s representatives were very positive during the discussions.

A new negotiating structure was now in place. Now would come its first test — the salary negotiations for 1985-86. The Association team was led by Bob Piercy who had immersed himself in the arcane details of University finance. Jean Jones and myself were the other members of the negotiating team who provided advice and support during the many caucus breaks which occurred during the process. The most difficult task for me during this time was keeping my mouth closed as I was instructed by those experienced in the process that only **one** person should speak during formal negotiations. The system worked and we reached a mutually agreeable remuneration package without having to go to the final-offer stage. This same result was attained over the next few years.

Thus far I have focused upon the side of my activities which dealt with remuneration. This is natural since this was the area in which I spent a great deal of my time. However, the Association was also active in a number of other areas during my term as President. Amongst other things, we set up and funded an *Ad Hoc* Status of Women Committee under the leadership of Jean Jones. *TA Panta* was

given sustenance as was the Debating Society. Comments were made on the University's submission to the Bovey Commission. An attempt was made to fathom the workings of the infamous Project Gemini (the pet project of the Vice-President Administration) and to understand the editorial musings of *Courier*.

In addition to Jean, Bob and Bill, I was fortunate to have outstanding Executive members. In no particular order they were Beth Csordas (Treasurer), Bob Johnston (Secretary), David Inman (Past President), Brian Latto (Pensions and Benefits), David Counts (Special Enquiries), Henry Schwarcz (Tenure), Graham Roebuck (Newsletter Editor), Bob McNutt and Jim Rice.

The Association has been extremely fortunate through the years to have outstanding individuals in the Executive Assistant position. In my case it was Joan Field. Not only did she keep a very busy office running smoothly but with her intelligence and common sense she provided me a sounding board for which I was constantly appreciative. That she kept me on time and relatively focused through the year was a bonus.

The proof that I enjoyed the job lies in the fact that I allowed my name to stand for the Vice-Presidential position a few years later, this time with full knowledge of the consequences. In retrospect, though, I must admit that I am not unhappy that I was an unappreciated candidate at that time.

1985/86 to 1987/88

1985/1986

J. M. Jones, President

April 25, 1986: The President's Report as recorded in the minutes of the Annual General Meeting is reproduced below.

President Jones expressed sincere appreciation of the contributions of her supportive and responsible Executive who had worked diligently on a wide range of tasks in the interests of the Association. She thanked all members who had given time and energy to serve on Association and university committees, and thanked the Executive Assistant, Joan Field, for her loyal support.

In reviewing the tenor, rather than the outcome,³² of this year's negotiations on remuneration, she wholeheartedly supported two points made by Professor Piercy in his report from the Salary Committee that the negotiations "were conducted in good faith by members of both the administration and the Association" and "we thought the possibility of going to binding arbitration played a major role in reaching a negotiated settlement without rancour". She considered those observations in the perspective of Professor Inman's presidential report to the Association in 1984 when he identified the unequal power and authority in the Joint Committee as the block to collegiality and offered that the "only possibility [of resolving the impasse] was agreement between the Association and the Board of Governors to binding arbitration on matters which could not be resolved by the current collegial process". She acknowledged considerable satisfaction that the restructuring of the President's Budget committee and of the Joint Committee had provided the milieu for more balanced bargaining. She said that, although the Association may not be satisfied with this year's settlement, the negotiators for the Association believe that bargaining was in good faith and with full knowledge.

President Jones said that much energy had been expended on lobbying governments for funding, not only for the universities but for support of the federal research councils.

Reviewing the activities of the *ad hoc* committees, President Jones mentioned the work undertaken to prepare a reasoned response, with the help of the Association Council, to the recommendations of the Space Consultant. Other *ad hoc* committees focused on the issues of mandatory retirement,³³ on the attitudes of McMaster faculty, and on matters which fall under the Occupational Health and Safety regulations.

Several annual events, sponsored by the Association, were reported by President Jones to have been successful, including the retirees' luncheon, the joint meeting of the Executive with the President's Executive, and the All Faculties Dinner and Lecture.

³²4% ATB plus full CP/M; establishment of the full tuition waiver.

³³Pending settlement in the courts, McMaster suspended mandatory retirement.

President Jones was reluctant to end her report on an apprehensive note but recognized significant trends, such as the University of British Columbia administration's attempt to dismiss 15 faculty members without due process, and the current protest against the proposal of the Board of Governors of the University of Sherbrooke to terminate 26.5 faculty positions without notice because of that university's deficit. She also reminded members of the proposal by the administration of the University of Toronto to jettison the Faculty of Architecture without consultation with the faculty involved there. President Jones also feared a trend on the part of the provincial government to interfere with the autonomy of Ontario universities, exemplified by its efforts to join OISE with the University of Toronto, and its conditions for the Excellence Fund setting university objectives to meet government priorities.

President Jones expected that the new Executive would welcome the challenge of countering these threatening trends and she hoped it would prove successful in the continuing struggle to defend academic freedom.

1986/1987
G. W. King, President

Campus Alliance

October 1, 1986: President's Remarks in the Faculty Association Newsletter

At a meeting with President Lee last week, the heads of the various constituency organisations on campus — MUAA, MUSA, MSU, GSA, MAPS and MUFA — agreed to form an alliance, to plan a publicity campaign to alert the public and government about our urgent need for increased funding. October is the best month for this because decisions are about to be made by the province about our level of support for next year.

I was impressed by two things at the meeting. The first was the seriousness of purpose and high degree of commitment shown by all parties, as compared to even a year ago. The second was the way in which the university presidents, through COU, are now working together to coordinate such publicity events on campuses across the province. The universities came later, and as amateurs, to the lobbying scene, but are proving to be fast learners.

I like to think that our efforts in the Joint Committee to improve faculty remuneration at McMaster have stimulated these welcome initiatives. When money was tight in past years, the response often was to blame faculty salary levels and to cut back on increases in them. There are still some voices calling for this simplistic approach, for cutting salary increases and for altering the Career Progress/Merit scheme. But all that this approach yields is disgruntled faculty, whose persistent querying of other expenditures produces disgruntled administrators. The best solution is surely to urge successfully our case for improved funding at Queen's Park, and back this up by publicity. Let us hope our lobbying will produce good results this year.

Mandatory Retirement

On October 15, 1986 Mr. Justice Gray of the Ontario Supreme Court released his judgement in the challenge to mandatory retirement brought under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* by seven university faculty members and one librarian, employed variously at the University of Toronto, York University, the University of Guelph and Laurentian University. The ruling upheld the propriety of

mandatory retirement.

During the previous two year the University agreed that anyone who wished to could defer retirement past the age of 65, up to the age of 68. This was done pending resolution of the question of applicability of the *Charter of Rights* to universities. As a result of Mr. Justice Gray's ruling, the University reverted to the original conditions of the Pension Plan which stated that the normal retirement date "is the first day of the month following the attainment of the Member's 65th birthday...." University employees would be able to defer retirement past 65 only with the consent of the University.

December 9, 1986: Moved and carried at the General Meeting

That the Faculty Association Executive is directed to appoint an *ad hoc* committee to recommend to the Association a new retirement policy for negotiation within the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee;

And that the *ad hoc* committee's work assumption will be that the University is allowed, under the law, to enforce mandatory retirement if it so decides;

And that issues to be considered by the *ad hoc* committee include:

1. Whether this University should have a mandatory retirement age;
2. If so, what that age should be;
3. What provisions should be made to encourage faculty who so desire to retire early;
4. If there are to be exceptions to mandatory retirement, on what grounds, by whom, and in what forum is that decision to be made?
5. If there is to be a mandatory retirement age, what provisions should be made for post-retirement teaching, and for office and laboratory space?

And that the *ad hoc* committee is to report to the General Meeting of the Faculty Association in the Spring of 1987.

April 29, 1987: Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review Retirement Policy which was endorsed by the membership.

Professor Eموke Szathmary, Chair of the Committee, reviewed the Report before the membership. The first issue considered had been the term most appropriate to describe the point at which retirement normally took place. The Committee had decided that the term "mandatory retirement age" was unacceptable but had no quarrel with the term "normal pensionable age".

The Committee regarded as unacceptable the association of retirement with normal pensionable age solely at the pleasure of the senior administration of the University. It would be more consistent with the principles of collegiality if normal pensionable age would serve as the age at which a member of faculty could retire or could request an academic decision, reached after due process, regarding the continuation of his or her appointment. Any decision to continue, or not to continue, a faculty member's appointment should be made by committees of the Department, Faculty, and Senate after assessment of the academic performance of the applicant. Academic merit must be the criterion used in making a decision on continuation of appointment beyond normal pensionable age.

Flexible Retirement

April 1, 1987: President's Remarks in Faculty Association Newsletter

The President's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Flexible Retirement reported on February 4th and both the Faculty Association and the Joint Committee have urged that the full Report be circulated to all members of the Pension Plan as an open document, so that members can see and weigh the options which it recommends.

The Report contains two separate proposals. The first is to abolish the 6% per annum penalty for early retirement for those who meet the "Rule of 80" for the total of age plus years of service. This is to be funded from the surplus in the Pension Plan. Abolition of the 6% pa penalty was rated very desirable in the Benefits questionnaire which was circulated to all faculty last fall. Your Executive has, therefore, endorsed the proposal, as has the Joint Committee, and it will be brought before the membership as an item of the Remuneration brief at the Special General meeting on April 15th.

The second proposal of the Flexible Retirement Committee Report concerns opening a "window", with special financial incentives for people who agree to take early retirement. This proposal is self-financing and may well save money in the University's operating budget in future years. Although this recommendation is outside the remuneration negotiations in the Joint Committee, the Faculty Association expects to be consulted if and when the University decides to implement the "window". However, no final decision has been made about this proposal.

April 29, 1987: President's Report as recorded in the minutes of the Annual General Meeting is reproduced below.

The President, Professor G. W. King, expressed his sincere appreciation to the members of his Executive who had given willingly of their time and effort to attend to faculty members and problems. He also thanked those who had served on Association committees, who had served as representatives on University Committees, and thanked Joan Field and her new assistant, Marg Forrest.

The first issue the President addressed was the current problems facing CAUT, brought on by the resignations, and pending resignations, of the larger member universities. The reasons for the withdrawals were mainly financial, in that big universities like Toronto and Calgary have large staffs in their own Association offices and feel they can look after their own interests. This, of course, was not the case with medium and smaller universities who rely heavily on CAUT, especially in remuneration negotiations and collective bargaining. Most faculty would agree that a national organization is necessary to lobby at the federal level, to represent faculty internationally, and to protect faculty rights when academic freedom and tenure are threatened. However, if too many large universities pull out, the national organization could be weakened to such an extent that it could never recover. The President felt that this Association had been well-served by CAUT in the past and, by and large, gets its money's worth in help and advice.

The second issue upon which the President commented concerned the Association's relations with the . The President of the University had asked the Association to form part of his campus alliance to help lobby the provincial government for increased funding. The Association agreed and spent a great deal of time and effort on publicity and lobbying for McMaster. The spirit of collegiality was greatly in evidence. But, as the year progressed,

there were differences of opinion on various matters: first, the way the mandatory retirement issue was handled; various other issues, and, last, the disagreement over faculty remuneration. Collegiality seemed to disappear when the Association took positions which differed from those of the . Letters to the President were ignored, the salary equity study was delayed, and the President went abroad at short notice when critical remuneration negotiations were in progress. President King concluded from this that collegiality is a fragile flower at McMaster.

The President then reviewed the salary negotiations and the lack of progress in the first two phases of the procedures. He had been expecting that matters would proceed to final offer selection but a meeting of the Joint Committee the previous evening had shown faint signs that the was facing the realities of the situation and might change their unreasonable position taken in Phases I and II. If negotiations did end up in final offer selection, the President thought the Association's case was a strong one in view of the booming economy in Ontario, the Ministry's apparent willingness to improve conditions in the universities, and the fact that other Ontario universities had awarded decent increases and catch-up components to their faculty for 1987-88.³⁴

In closing, the President said that it had been a pleasure and an honour to serve as Association President, and he wished the new President, Professor Henry Schwarcz, every success.

1987/1988

H. P. Schwarcz, President

April 18, 1988: The President's Report delivered at the Annual General Meeting is reproduced below in its entirety.

This year has been about as eventful as anyone could wish, and continues to bring forth surprises up to the very end. The year began with a bang with the issue of the University's partial pension holiday, which allowed the University to present an almost balanced budget to the Board of Governors, but left the faculty and the other participants in the Pension Plan with the feeling that they were being done in. While the action was apparently legal, it was carried out unilaterally by the Finance Committee of the Board and provoked an angry outburst from this Association that changes in the Fund should be done only after open discussion with, and consent of, the Plan members. With such a start, I feared that the year was going to be an "interesting" one, indeed.

Things got even more interesting about Christmas when we exchanged salary and benefit proposals with the . With the memory of the selector's award of 2.5% catchup still fresh in our minds, we proposed that the process of salary catch-up continue through the next year. It was not surprising that the did not share this suggestion, but it was somewhat disconcerting to see that they were not going to offer to continue the existing career-progress and merit plan. While we agreed with them that the system was creaky and needed an overhaul, we were not too thrilled with the prospect of having a measly 1% of merit award doled out strictly on the advice of the Deans.

³⁴Negotiations did end in Final Offer Selection. The Selector, Ross L. Kennedy, chose the Association's final position: ATB of 4.2%; Catch-up of 2.5% and implementation of the CP/M Plan.

Given that inauspicious start, it was with considerable pleasure and a certain amount of surprise that the members of Joint Committee were able to bring forward to you a few weeks ago a salary and benefits proposal which went a long way towards meeting the goals which we set out in December. I am equally grateful to you, the membership at large, for resoundingly ratifying that proposal. A large part of our satisfaction with that agreement comes from the fact that it was achieved in the Joint Committee, even after certain words were muttered about the illusion of collegiality evaporating in the heat of bargaining. This year's experience shows, we believe, that the system does work, and we think it can continue to do so.

One of the factors that may have led to the system working this year was the prospect that this University is seeing a noticeable turn in its fortunes, paralleled to some extent by the Ontario University system as a whole. Student numbers are rising, and with them tuition funds, and eventually base funding as well through a rise in our funding corridor. At the same time, the University expects to make some savings through the early retirement window, but the amounts are still uncertain. In addition, although the base funding increases to the university system are not going up faster than inflation, the special envelope system being used by the ministry seems to be favouring an institution such as ours, especially through its strength in research. But there is no doubt, ultimately, that our ability to recover lost economic ground depends on pressure being put on Queen's Park to boost the base funding of the entire system in the way the forward-looking state governments in the U.S. have done in recent years. It may be a harbinger of better things to come, that the Minister of Colleges and Universities took the time to talk with Faculty Association representatives and other interest groups on campus when she came here recently to announce the awarding of the funds for the Mills Library expansion.

Two minor items that lingered from last year's negotiations were the details of the improved out-of-province health care benefits and a form of mortgage insurance. The former have now been put in place and the mortgage insurance is in the process of being circulated.

The year has been marked by a number of other interesting events. For example, this was the year of the Centres of Excellence, which seem to be veritably showering new funds on the engineering and science side of the campus, while having relatively little effect on much of the rest of the University. Perhaps this is also a harbinger of the way the province feels about the universities: that they should become bread-winners by teaming up their creative genius with the corporate system. This approach will not be too helpful in those corners of academia which are concerned with preserving the humanistic treasures of civilization, let alone with those social scientists who might be interested in analysing and critically commenting on the accumulation of wealth in our society and its social consequences. We are obviously not about to turn down offers of major financial support these days. We must at the same time be sure to keep a close eye on what sort of strings might be attached, and that this largesse does not change the fundamental nature of this University, or distort the balance between the various academic disciplines.

This was also the year in which we found out the sad truth about what had happened to the University's ill fated commercial venture called CIM. While we lost heavily on that deal, and the money came out of our precious Hooker fund, we hope that the has got the message from that fiasco that business ventures of that sort, or any sort, must be reported on frequently and openly, and not hidden away while they go sour, like a batch of bad wine in the cellar.

This year also saw some progress toward restoring wage equality between male and female faculty. The University found itself under new pressures to do so from two fronts: the

province with its new Employment Equity bill, and the federal government who attached employment equity as a condition to receiving major contracts. Spurred on by our representatives in the Joint Committee, the is pushing ahead on the salary equity survey, as I noted earlier, and it will be used ultimately to address salary anomaly adjustments.

For over a decade we have used a Career Progress and Merit Plan to assign annual salary increments above the ATB increases. As I also mentioned earlier, this plan has lately gotten into trouble for a variety of reasons. Mainly, the floor of the plan has suffered, along with all our salaries, from salary erosion due to failure to keep up with the cost of living. The main effect of this has been that some professors entered the plan well above the floor and soon got above the first or even the second breakpoint, after which they received no more benefit from the plan: they are on the infamous plateau of higher learning. The plan has other problems which need cleaning up as well. One of the points on which the Joint Committee agreed was the need to revise that plan: we have set about to do so and by the end of summer the Joint Committee hopes to present you with a new and better plan that will be, moreover, self-correcting so that it does not fall into bad times like the last one.

So, as salary negotiations ended successfully, and I breathed a sigh of relief that the year would now draw quietly to a close, I was not too delighted to find that, in my twilight days in this chair I was being hit by all sorts of unexpected flying debris. Let me tell you, very briefly, about the two major items that have flown in the window, just as a lot of faculty were cheerfully jumping out.

First, we received in the office the other day a notice that CUEW, best known to you as the union that represents TA's, has filed for certification of part-time faculty. That comes as a complete surprise (we did hear about it a few weeks ago) at the end of a year when one of our subcommittees had been working very hard to find out about who were part-time professors at McMaster, to learn about their working conditions, and ultimately to try to recruit more of them into the Association, since most of them are indeed eligible to join. Having now heard of CUEW's proposal to certify this group, we are doing what the OLRB calls "intervening" on behalf of these faculty. I am not too happy about the prospect of some of the McMaster faculty being certified, and I have, you may be assured, no desire at this time to have the rest of us certified.

The second problem that has been coming up, though not so abruptly, has been a move by the clinical professors of the Faculty of Health Sciences to form their own Faculty Association. This has come about because of the problems they have been having with respect to the University's pension plan. It seems that a large number of these professors have been contributing more money to the plan than they could legally take back out. This comes about because there is a maximum amount of pension that one can be paid from a registered plan. The salaries of some of these professors are such that, when they retire, the pension benefits they should be receiving according to the University's plan are greater than the maximum allowed. So, they, the clinical professors, have been formulating various alternative plans with the aid of actuaries. Many of these professors are not eligible for membership in our Association and many of those who are eligible are not in fact members: hence, the move to start a new association. While we agree that there are some aspects of their plight which are unique to clinical professors and the way in which they are paid clinical earnings, nevertheless, we are again worried (as with CUEW) about the Balkanization of our faculty. One faculty association seems like a nice number to work with. Two is too many, and three is bound to be a serious problem. So, we are trying to work something out through an *ad hoc* committee.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all those who helped me make

this year as successful and bearable as it was: to the members of the Executive who shared so much of the work, to the Vice-President, John Lott, on whose competent shoulders all of this will now fall, and especially to my able Executive Assistant Joan Field and her new adjutant, soon to be incumbent in that job, Betty May Lamb. Joan has been with the Association since 1975, and threatened to retire this year. Luckily for John, she has decided to stay around on reduced load for the next year but it is clear that Betty May is quickly learning the ropes and we should have a smooth transition and a transmission of all the complex lore that is needed to run this Association, such as where the paper punch is kept.

John Lott

1988/1989

I believe this special volume is intended to provide perspectives on the Faculty Association as an organization. From the perspective of President in 1988/89, I plan to consider the organization and its people, important events and issues, problems and successes.

The Organization and Key People

People with a profound commitment to the academic enterprise are the heart of the McMaster University Faculty Association (MUFA). During my association with the Faculty Association I was most fortunate to meet and work with many dedicated and talented individuals. Problems needed to be tackled and solved but, people made things happen. The numerous dedicated volunteers, backed by the Association's first rate staff, were, and still are, the mainstay of this organization. I was lucky to be asked to lead this organization during 1988/89. While I cannot name and praise all the dedicated people I worked with, they know who they are and I thank them all.

The McMaster University Faculty Association (MUFA) is an organization that promotes higher education and the interests of the professorate at the university, provincial and national levels. Provincial level and national level lobbying and policy formation are carried out by the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). Fees that faculty members pay support the activities of OCUFA and CAUT, but it is the McMaster University level activities that I will dwell on here. I was Vice-President of MUFA in 1987/88 under Henry Schwarcz, President in 1988/89 and Past-President the following year when Daphne Maurer was President. In two of those years I was one of three Faculty Association representatives on the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee.

The elected Executive Committee had about fourteen representatives from different faculties and different ranks, and thus formed a microcosm of the professorate at McMaster University. Members of the Executive Committee decided on certain issues and, through ballots, obtained direction from the membership as a whole. Individual members of the Executive Committee headed the many standing and *ad hoc* committees that focussed on special topics such as Academic Affairs, Special Enquiries and Grievances, Status of Women, Tenure, Pension, Remuneration, CAUT and OCUFA policy, and others. A new *ad hoc* committee dealing with pension issues was established and chaired by Doug Welland. In addition, the Faculty Association provided representatives to a number of University committees and boards. Parking and pensions certainly were hot topics when I was President.

I was fortunate during my stint on the Executive to work with several key staff members that kept the functions of the association focussed as Executives changed each year. Joan Field did so much for the Association during her many years as our Executive Assistant. Her great knowledge of the way the University functioned, her knowledge of the Faculty Association and her insight on thorny issues was very useful to my Executive. I remember well the reception we held for Joan Field when she retired. I was involved in recruiting Joan Field's replacement, Betty May Lamb. Betty May Lamb learned a lot from Joan while they worked together during the transition. I, like many others who found Betty May such a delight to work with, was deeply saddened by her death from cancer in December 1991. Secretary, Kelly McCaughey, whom I helped recruit to assist the Association as it grew, began work for the MUFA in March 1989 and has provided dedicated service ever since. To all the dedicated MUFA staff I worked with, a heartfelt thank you. All faculty at McMaster, whether they realize it or not, owe Joan Field a special thanks for her determination in the pursuit of good

policy, procedures and faculty remuneration at McMaster. Putting together a final offer brief drew on Joan's skills and she helped wonderfully.

One person I have enjoyed working with on Association business over many years is Bernadette Lynn. She served with me on the Joint Committee in 1987/88 and 1988/89 and was on my Executive. I appreciated very much her keen mind, friendliness, ability to understand the nuances of complex budget information, willingness to work hard, and intolerance of bafflegab. Bernadette has just finished a year as President and has been involved with remuneration issues for many years. Thanks Bernadette.

One unusual situation I faced as President was when the elected Vice-President, Joe Rose, decided to withdraw from his VP and Joint Committee role, but was willing to continue to serve on the Executive of the Association. Doug Welland from Economics was appointed to replace Joe Rose on the Joint Committee and an election gave MUFA a new VP, Daphne Maurer from the Department of Psychology. Daphne was a marvelous replacement VP and went on to lead the Association into a very important area that Doug Welland worked on so hard, the pension surplus dispute.

During my year as President, MUFA developed stronger links with other employee groups on campus. This was spurred on by the emerging pension-related issues. The professional librarians group, MUPLA, asked me to make a presentation to their group and discuss procedures. The forty or so members of this group had never presented a salary brief before and needed help. There was a general feeling that a closer link to MUFA was desirable because in many universities, professional librarians are a part of the Faculty Association. No formal links developed while I was on the Executive, but such links now exist and the professional librarians are part of MUFA. While I was President I discussed issues with those forming a Clinical Faculty Association (CFA). That group was formed and I attended their inaugural meeting on October 13, 1988 as a representative of MUFA. Since that time, I believe, the CFA and MUFA invite observers to each others' meetings to maintain a close liaison. With regard to pension issues, I also met with support staff executive members, including Barry Diacon, who is now President of the recently certified union MUSA (the McMaster University Staff Association).

Remunerations, Benefits and Working Conditions

While I was President remuneration issues were considered each year in the Joint Committee, so a key role for the MUFA Executive was to negotiate wages and benefits for all non-clinical faculty. Those negotiations took place, and still do, under rules established for the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee to Consider University Financial Matters and to Discuss and Negotiate Matters Related to Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty. The Joint Committee consists of three faculty appointed by MUFA and three members appointed by the President of the University. The terms of office for the MUFA Executive Committee and the Joint Committee do not completely coincide, but for most of the year that I was President of MUFA, I was also Chair of the Joint Committee. Under the Joint Committee system, if settlement cannot be reached in phases I and II, then final offer selection procedures follow. During Phases I and II we did reach settlement of certain issues, including: a new Career Progress/Merit Plan, a new Parental Leave Policy (that included provisions for paternity leave and unpaid child care leave), improvement in the life-time limit for out-of-province major medical coverage to \$100,000 for active faculty and an across-the-board increase of 4.0% based on the Canada-wide consumer price index value. We were not able to obtain a satisfactory settlement on several other issues including salary catch-up, a salary anomalies fund and, the pension anomaly correction so we went to Final Offer Selection. I met with the Provost, Les King (who became MUFA President a decade later), and selected one of three envelopes, a process that gave us one selector from a potential panel of three. (In case you wonder, the other two envelopes were then opened to ensure all three potential selectors names were in the three envelopes.) Since only a week is allowed to prepare the Final Offer Selection Brief, many

people worked extremely long hours writing and fine-tuning our brief. A great deal of strategy goes into preparing such a brief since the selector must choose either the MUFA or the Administration proposal in its entirety.

As will be discussed later, a key issue was whether or not to include a pension related issue. We did so and may well have lost the selector's decision as a result, but we clearly helped to place pension issues as a remuneration item that is arbitrable. From the outset of negotiations, the Administration took the approach that pension improvements could not be considered. While we "lost" the final offer selection decision, the membership should keep in mind that the Administration's final position on salary catch-up and a salary anomaly fund in their brief was better than anything offered to us during bargaining. For myself, Doug Welland and Bernadette Lynn the meeting with the selector and the Administration team of Les King, Dennis McCalla and Ron Childs was a tense but interesting experience.

One of the items I was involved in extensively was negotiating in the Joint Committee a revised CP/M Scheme for faculty that allowed for 120 par units per 100 faculty members. This was an important change that allowed department chairs to reward some faculty with above average merit awards without the necessity of giving another faculty member a message that he or she was below average. Another improvement was a requirement that faculty be told of the criteria for merit awards. This seems like an obvious concept but in many departments this information was not given to the faculty. A tremendous amount of effort went into this CP/M plan in the Joint Committee and it was only agreed to just before Final Offer Selection.

Pension Issues

The Faculty Association faced difficult issues related to our pension plan. This included the pension anomaly dispute over inflation compensation missed by those who retire July 1 compared to other times in the year. It also included unnecessary changes to the Pension Plan text, pension contribution holidays taken by the Administration, and plans for use of the pension surplus. In the Fall of 1988 the University had three different committees considering aspects of our Pension Plan. One we nicknamed the "grab committee".

At the General Meeting on December 8, 1988 the membership unanimously passed a motion by Alan Kay and Daphne Maurer

That permission be asked to give a presentation to the Board of Governors on December 15 regarding our pension concerns. Other employee groups should be invited to participate in the presentation.

As President of MUFA, I organized and made what I believe was the broadest employee group protest to the Board of Governors that had been made to that time. I organized a coalition of MUFA, MUPLA, CFA and MUSA. I spoke to the Board of Governors of McMaster University to protest unnecessary changes to the McMaster Pension Plan. The changes were designed to make all surplus pension funds the property of McMaster. The Board ignored the protests of most of the employees of McMaster and approved unnecessary changes in the pension text. Pension issues are complex and have continued to be to this day. The fundamental issue was this: the Board felt that if there was a shortage in the pension fund because they took pension "holidays", they would be responsible. The employee groups argued that if pension finances went poorly, the Board would have to demand concessions from the employees.

Pension issues are complex ones which have consumed a lot of Association time and effort since I was President. I believe the effort I and others on the Executive, especially Doug Welland, made in 1988/89 was to increase awareness of the importance of considering post-retirement compensation

as a significant part of overall compensation. The University Administration felt it could treat the pension surplus as their money and change the Plan text as they saw fit. The Association felt that the surplus was the employees' money. An important point was our argument that the Joint Committee was required to deal with such issues in the overall remuneration context. By including a pension issue in our final offer package, we helped cement the role of the Joint Committee in pension considerations. The pension disputes that we pursued lead on to the legal challenge headed by my successor, Daphne Maurer. Eventually the dedication of many who followed up on these issues has led to the current situation where a pension surplus sharing plan is underway that will result in the University and the employees equally sharing about \$150 million. I believe the University would not be agreeing to this sharing without the concerted action of the Faculty Association and other employee groups. I like to think that the actions of my Executive started a process that eventually led to this sharing of a very large amount of money. Our actions also helped create a group of people who are very knowledgeable about pension matters and will provide good advice to the Association in the future. I am willing to bet it will be necessary to remind the Administration again and again that pension is a remuneration issue that must go through the Joint Committee.

Other Association Initiatives

During the year I was President of MUFA several new initiatives were undertaken.

- Dr. Mark Sproule-Jones brought forth the need for an Employee Assistance Program for McMaster. We asked the University President to set up such a support system. It took some time but we now have an Employee Assistance Program at Hurst Place in Hamilton. This program provides counseling and other help to employees and their families for various family/personal problems.
- A committee was set up to study safety and workplace environment issues in response to the University's attempt to download responsibilities and liabilities. Ten years later the University still pushes "due diligence" programmes to target faculty yet fails to adequately provide such basics as safe and ergonomically designed chairs for all staff, faculty and graduate students.
- Gerry King and David Winch headed an *ad hoc* committee to investigate procedures regarding incorporation and made recommendations concerning necessary changes to the constitution and by-laws. This involved seeking permission from the Board of Governors, under University seal, to use the name "McMaster University Faculty Association". Constitution changes were brought to the Annual General Meeting on April 24, 1989 for ratification. This move to incorporation was important to protect members of the Executive Committee from personal liability.
- During my term the Canadian Union of Educational Workers applied for certification of part-time instructors. A number of retired faculty, who continued to teach part-time, asked MUFA to intervene to exclude them from the union. As a result of interventions funded by MUFA, individuals in this category were excluded from the bargaining unit.
- The Status of Women Committee, especially Maroussia Ahmed and Isik Zeytinoglu, worked very hard on several items including maternity/parental leave, part-time faculty and employment equity.
- The Executive debated and sent in comments regarding our concerns about the wisdom of the University proposal to create a new position of Vice-President Research. A decade later, I think many faculty would agree that the creation of this position was not a happy decision.
- My Executive had to come to grips with ongoing problems and cost overruns with regard to the *Ta Panta* publication. Some individuals felt it was an important use of Association funds and others

were very upset by such expenditures. A process was started to survey faculty for their input. *Ta Panta* ended publication a number of years later.

Problems and Disappointments

The Executive dealt with many problems. I will be surprised if parking does not get raised as an issue almost every year for the Executive. For myself the biggest disappointment was the non-collegial attitude the Administration showed to us on many occasions. We got to routinely distrust data the Administration supplied to us in the Joint Committee. Perhaps I was naive to expect that when I, as President of the Faculty Association, wrote President Lee on an important issue like pensions I would receive a reply in reasonable time. The following item from my report to the membership on April 24, 1989 is worth repeating and seems very relevant in 2001.

The Administration, who often prefer not to have the wisdom of their decisions challenged and who seem to prefer to exclude the Faculty Association from certain key decision-making situations that we should be involved in, are content to describe the Association in unflattering terms. In their view, we are perhaps a narrow and self-serving interest group who have no great concern for the well-being of the University. What rubbish! The article by Professor David Winch, published in the *Courier* a few issues ago, nicely sums up the current situation. This Faculty Association sees the faculty at McMaster as a key element in the running of the University, not merely as employees to be ordered around by the Administration. I am afraid the current situation of distrust will persist and likely will get worse until there are major changes in the attitudes of the Administration. During the past year I have observed the growing distrust of our Administration in several areas that concern not just members of this Association, but also support staff, professional librarians, part-time teachers and clinical faculty.

Conclusions

One question a reader might ask is “why did I seek to become President of the Faculty Association”? I had, prior to being asked to become Vice-President, been on the Executive for several years starting in 1981/82. I thus was reasonably familiar with the Faculty Association and its important roles. The department I am from had a number of strong-willed people so I definitely did not have any desire to seek chairmanship of my department as a means of experiencing a more rigorous administrative role. When I was asked to consider leading the Association I agreed, after considerable deliberation, because I felt it was a role where I had the potential to do considerable good for the professoriate. Negotiating wages, benefits and working conditions for about one thousand faculty is a huge responsibility; most other administrative duties that a faculty member carries out during his/her career pale in comparison.

When I was President of the Faculty Association I was constantly busy with duties, but I particularly remember my association with many wonderful people.

1989/1990

President: D. M. Maurer

May 1, 1990: The President's Report at the Annual General Meeting is reproduced in its entirety.

The year got off to a usual start with a crisis over parking. The conflict this time was between the addition of spaces to offset those which will disappear during construction versus the saving of green space and trees. Partly as a result of a protest begun by last year's Executive Committee, the space around Thode Library and behind Wentworth House is still green.

In other ways the year was anything but usual. It was overshadowed by the pension dispute. We had 30 Executive Committee meetings instead of the normal 18, some at short notice, all for many hours, and with virtually every agenda beginning with the pension dispute as the first matter arising.

As you must know by now, the dispute concerns pension contribution holidays which the University began to take in 1987 and amendments to the text of the pension plan which the Board of Governors passed some 1 ½ years later, purportedly to allow such holidays. We spent the fall trying to find an internal settlement to the dispute. Even though those efforts came to naught and the Association has filed suit, we continue to search for an out-of-court settlement through formal presentations to the Board of Governors and through informal contacts with Board members and with the Administration. We do so not because our legal position is weak. Quite the contrary. We do so because we believe it is better for a university to govern itself and to resolve its own disputes.

Not only did the pension dispute lead to many meetings and much cogitating, but it also necessitated considerable effort to keep you and the larger university community informed — through the newsletter, special bulletins, the Faculty Association's column in *The Courier*, and press releases. As well, it gave me the distinction of being probably the only President of the Association to ask for two increases in mill rate in one year: one last June and a second one in February to finance the law suit.

A second major effort was the negotiation of remuneration for 1990-91. Although the decision was made by Final Offer Selection, it's important to note that most parts of the package were decided at the table. This illustrates the fact that we found much common ground in the Joint Committee this year.

The last part of the package — catch-up — was decided by Final Offer Selection. The Selector chose between 0.9% offered by the Administration (up from the 0.65% they had offered on the last day of negotiations) and 2% claimed by the Association. We used many arguments to justify 2% catch-up. A precis appears in the Faculty Association's column in the April 24th issue of *The Courier*. The Selector, Owen Shime, chose the Association's position. He has not yet sent his reasons.

A small team worked very hard to put together the Association's case. Ten people pitched in to produce hundreds of pages of documentation in a short time — the whole process took only 3 weeks. Incidentally, data provided by the provincial organization, OCUFA, was invaluable in preparing our case.

Was it worth the effort? I found myself asking that question when it was over. To answer

it, I considered a forty-one year old associate professor earning an average salary. To receive a salary increase which is 1.1% larger (i.e., 2% catch-up instead of 0.9%) is worth \$671 to such an individual this year and during each of the next 22 years before retirement, which accumulates to \$15,445, without considering the compounding which will occur if we win additional catch-up in the future, without considering the increased value of awards under our career progress/merit scheme, and without considering the larger pension to which this individual will be entitled. It was worth the effort!

Although the pension dispute and salary negotiations are the activities of which you are most aware, it is important for you to realize that the Faculty Association is concerned with many other issues. Let me illustrate with four major initiatives we undertook this year. The first is the report on the Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster. This report was prepared over a number of years by a subcommittee of the Faculty Association's Status of Women Committee. It examined the role of women in the governance of the University and their perceptions about its functioning. The results suggested that, although McMaster functions well in many areas, there is still room for improved integration of female faculty, and in some areas for improved integration of male faculty as well.

The issuing of the report last fall was followed by a workshop well attended by faculty and administrators. It sparked interest and debate: debate about the extent of the problems identified in the report and the adequacy of its methodology, but at the same time recognition that some action is warranted. That led the Joint Committee to set up a task force to study the report and to make recommendations.

Even before we received those recommendations, the report has had an impact: it has raised the awareness of the need for more open decision-making. An example of this awareness is the method by which the members of the task force itself were selected. A letter went to all faculty describing the mandate of the task force and asking for individuals interested in being considered to identify themselves.

A second initiative resulted from a report prepared by Frank Denton and Christine Feaver of the Department of Economics at the request of Les King, then Vice-President (Academic). The report suggests that in some cases female faculty are paid less well than men. I say "suggests" because some variables known to be important to the setting of salaries were not included in the analysis (this is not a criticism: they could not easily have been included). The Joint Committee is designing a procedure for reviewing the salaries of all faculty in the career progress/merit scheme and making adjustments where appropriate. The proposed procedure will shortly be circulated for comment.

A third initiative is the design of a grievance procedure so that a faculty member can appeal the decision of an administrator. I believe we are the only Ontario university without such a procedure. Not having it available can lead to acrimony, which does not dissipate quickly. The Joint Committee has appointed a working group to draft a procedure following principles which were worked out by the Association and the Joint Committee. They will be reporting shortly. The goal, of course, is to design a procedure which is viewed as fair by all parties.

A fourth initiative is a report which is about to appear on sexual harassment. It is a very good report which describes problems at McMaster, outlines difficulties with our current diffuse procedures, and emphasizes the need for education. The report is a joint effort of representatives of faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students, who worked together very effectively.

Those were major initiatives. There were also a large number of smaller initiatives, many of

which are summarized in the committee reports you received with the agenda for today's meeting. I'd like to give you the flavour of the variety in the Association's work by listing a few others.

- (1) We prepared a brief for the Committee to Select a New President describing the qualities we thought they should be looking for.
- (2) We organized luncheons for retired faculty, for new faculty, and for faculty concerned with women's issues.
- (3) We raised concerns about the autocratic way decisions are made about salary increases for clinical faculty.
- (4) We raised concerns about the ventilation of smoking lounges.
- (5) We successfully opposed a plan whereby Toronto telephone lines would have been eliminated.
- (6) We argued successfully in the Joint Committee for the extension of a full faculty allowance to all faculty in Health Sciences in the career progress/merit scheme.
- (7) We raised concerns about proposed revisions to the Senate Procedures for Violations of Human Rights, which are the procedures that cases of sexual harassment fall under. Those revisions have been put on hold pending the report on sexual harassment.
- (8) Recently we questioned the wisdom of making a commitment now to building a university centre. We recognize the long-standing need for such a centre but question a commitment to build it when money is needed to complete and operate the buildings currently under construction and when we are told that the budget is so tight that the size of the Faculty must be reduced despite increasing enrollment.
- (9) And we took a position in the Joint Committee on the inappropriateness of the hiring freeze, about which we had not been consulted.

Throughout the year we worked with new vice-presidents, in particular, Art Heidebrecht, the Vice-President (Academic), and Sandy Darling, the Vice-President (Administration). Much of the time we worked well together, overcoming the mutual distrust of recent years and working together toward the common goal of a well-governed university. In other words, we managed the collegial discussions the Association has so often talked about. There is a lesson here for both sides. For the Faculty Association, the lesson is that we can work with, rather than against, the Administration. For the Administration, the lesson is that consultation works.

But there were exceptions, which undermined the good will. An index of the new climate in the Administration is that I can call them exceptions. They arose from failures to consult about decisions affecting faculty. The Association then commented on problems we saw with the decisions. Our voices became more shrill. The Administration naturally reacted defensively, often resenting the interference of the Association. And it became more difficult to keep the discussion focussed on the merits of the argument rather than issues of power and authority.

Let us hope that the new president, Dr. Kenney-Wallace, will be so committed to working with faculty that even the exceptions will disappear.

The work I've described was made possible by a large number of volunteers. To start, you elected a strong and dedicated Executive Committee. But the volunteers who work for the Association go well beyond the Executive Committee. The list printed elsewhere in this issue runs for more than three pages. It is printed both as a thank you to the many people who helped out this year and as a solicitation for next year. Please let us know what you'd like to do.

I'd like to single out three people for special mention. My thanks to the two assistants in the office: Betty May Lamb and Kelly McCaughey. Betty May and Kelly are cheerful, dedicated, and knowledgeable assistants, on whom I could always depend.

A final and very special thanks goes to Grant Smith, the Vice-President this year and shortly to be your President. Grant shared the load with me throughout the year. I am extremely grateful to Grant for his counsel, for his hard work, for his openness and honesty, and for his good humour. The Association will be in good hands when he takes over the presidency in one week's time.

Brief History of the Pension Dispute (as reported in various issues of the Association's *Newsletter* during 1989/90)

1987 to date:

University reduces its contributions to the pension plan despite objections from the Faculty Association, the Staff Association, the Clinical Faculty Association, and the Professional Librarians Association. The contribution "holiday" now exceeds \$12 million.

December 1988, Board of Governors:

Amendments approved which purport to make the contribution holiday legitimate, despite a protest on behalf of members of the plan presented by Dr. John Lott, President of the Faculty Association.

March 5, 1989:

President Lee was sent a letter from the presidents of the Faculty Association, the Staff Association, the Clinical Faculty Association, and the Professional Librarians Association, requesting that a committee be set up to reconsider the amendment. No reply has ever been received.

Summer, 1989:

Faculty Association obtains a legal opinion from Sack, Goldblatt, and Mitchell indicating that neither the university's contribution holiday nor the December 1988 amendments to the text of the pension plan would be likely to stand up in court.

October 18- December 8, 1989:

20 hours of negotiations between the President and Vice-President of the Faculty Association (Daphne Maurer and Grant Smith) and the Chairman of the Board (Glen Chambers), the President of the university (Alvin Lee), and the Vice-President, Administration (A. L. Darling).

Weekly meetings of the Executive Committee to offer guidance to the negotiators.

Briefings of the presidents of the Staff Association, the Professional Librarians' Association, and the Clinical Faculty Association, who indicate their full support and agree to share legal expenses.

November 7, 1989:

Special bulletin describing the negotiations sent to members of the Faculty Association

November 24, 1989:

Dr. Maurer makes a presentation to OCUFA Board. They pass unanimously the motion:

...that the OCUFA Board condemns the unilateral actions of the Board and administration of McMaster University in reducing their contributions to the pension plan, and endorses the position of the McMaster University Faculty Association in their efforts to reverse the decision and to recover the withheld contributions.

Motion sent to Mr. Chambers and Dr. Lee.

December 5, 1989:

Faculty Association column in *The Courier* entitled "The Pension Dispute: Can We Avoid Court?"

December 8, 1989:

Breakdown of negotiations. Progress had been made on minor issues (e.g., setting aside the disputed amendments for further discussion) but the major issue — the procedure for deciding the University's contribution to our pension fund — could not be resolved.

December 12, 1989 — General Meeting:

Drs. Maurer and Smith report on the breakdown of negotiations.

Unanimous vote to conduct a mailed ballot on the initiation of legal action against the University

Letters sent to non-members informing them of the upcoming vote and suggesting that they join the Association in order to participate.

December 13, 1989 — Board of Governor's meeting:

Motion passed to leave the disputed amendments out of the pension text, pending further discussion.

Dr. Maurer makes a presentation on behalf of the Faculty Association. She expresses sorrow at the breakdown of negotiations and appeals for assistance in finding a way to break the impasse.

December 15, 1989:

Members receive a written report from the Faculty Association's negotiators.

December 19, 1989 — Extraordinary Meeting:

Information session with your negotiators and with the Faculty Association's lawyer, Cathy Lace, from Sack, Goldblatt, and Mitchell.

January 4, 1990:

Ballots mailed to all members, asking whether they agree that the Executive Committee may initiate legal action against the University over the pension dispute and whether they authorize an increase in mill rate effective February 1st from 5.5 to 6.2.

January 15, 1990:

Returning Officer informs the Executive Committee that ballots were returned by 382 members

(67.6%), who voted as follows:

- 331 [86.6%] agreed that the Executive Committee may initiate legal action and raise the mill rate
- 48 [12.6%] disagreed
- 3 [0.7%] abstained

Report sent to members by the next morning.

January 15/16, 1990:

Dr. Maurer informs Mr. Chambers, President Lee, and Mr. Darling of the results of the ballot

Association issues a press release on the dispute and the results of the ballot. It emphasized again the desire of the Faculty Association to find an internal settlement.

Press coverage in *The Spectator*, on CKOC, CHML, CKDS

January 17, 1990:

Your negotiators meet with Mr. Chambers, President Lee, and Mr. Darling. The Administration suggests mediation, but indicates no flexibility on the main issue in dispute — the procedure by which decisions are made about the level of the University's contribution to the Pension Plan.

January 18, 1990 — Executive Committee Meeting:

After a lengthy debate, the Executive Committee decides unanimously to instruct our lawyer to file suit against the university while at the same time entering into mediation with the University. They decide that these are the conditions under which mediation is most likely to be successful.

January 18/19, 1990:

Drs. Maurer and Smith meet with the presidents of the Staff Association, Professional Librarians Association, and Clinical Faculty Association (Barry Diacon, Tom Fleming, and Neil Toews, respectively), who indicate their continuing support.

Association issues a press release on the decision to enter mediation and to instruct our lawyers to file suit.

Press coverage in *The Spectator*, *The Globe and Mail*, *The Sun*, and on CKOC, CHML, CKDS

January 22 - February 1, 1990:

Innumerable meetings and phone calls to thrash out the details of mediation. Kevin Burkett chosen as the mediator. On the advice of the Administration's lawyer, Mr. Chambers withdraws from mediation. The Faculty Association's representatives express regret at this decision because no representative of the Board of Governors will be present during an attempt to resolve a dispute involving the actions of the Board.

Weekly Executive Committee meetings continue to offer advice to your negotiators.

February 6, 1990:

Faculty Association column in *The Courier* on why the Faculty is willing to go to court over the pension dispute.

Kevin Burkett brought in as mediator. Mediation fails .

February 10, 1990:

Dr. Maurer makes a presentation to the Council of CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). CAUT Council, which represents more than 25,000 university teachers passes unanimously the following motion:

The Council of CAUT condemns the unilateral actions of the Board and administration of McMaster University in reducing their contributions to the pension plan, and endorses the position of the McMaster University Faculty Association in their efforts to restore joint decision-making and to recover the withheld contributions.

The Faculty Association remains open to discussion of an out-of-court settlement.

May 22, 1990:

The President of the Faculty Association serves papers on the President of the University, formally beginning legal actions in the pension dispute. The suit is being filed by Daphne Maurer, Grant Smith, and Gerry Field on behalf of all members of the McMaster University Faculty Association and on behalf of all beneficiaries of the Pension Plan. The court date set for the commencement of the case is May 11, 1990 — later adjourned until September 25, then to December 10, 1990.

[See submission from Grant Smith, following, for more discussion of the pension dispute.]

Grant K. Smith

1990/1991

My year as President was dominated by an event that had occurred ten months before, during the Presidency of Professor Daphne Maurer. The event was the decision of the Ontario NDP government under Premier Bob Rae in September of 1989, to make drastic reductions in the transfer payments to the Ontario university system; an event which occupied much of MUFA's attention during that year and for some years to follow.

In response to the government's funding cuts, the University Administration in conjunction with the Board of Governors undertook a number of measures to reduce expenditures. Referred to as the "Budget Reduction Strategy", these measures included Faculty Complement Reduction, Strategic Planning, and Holidays from contribution to the Pension Plan for salaried staff.

Budget Reduction Strategy

FACULTY COMPLEMENT REDUCTION

This component called for a 5% reduction in the full-time continuing faculty salary base over five years for an estimated savings to the operating fund of \$2.6 million. The success of the plan depended on the elimination of some programmes and the curtailment of others. The policy was met with mixed responses from Faculty Deans. On the one hand Humanities had absorbed the loss of five positions, on the other, the Faculty of Science strongly questioned the need to cut any positions; there had been a steady increase in student/faculty ratio over the previous decade (from 16.2 to 1 in 1979/80 to 20.9 to 1 in 1988/89) and there was a wave of retirements on the horizon both of which, in the opinion of the Faculty of Science, were powerful arguments that they should be hiring.

Was this an irresponsible position for the Science Faculty to take? There is no doubt that the financial position of the Ontario university system was very serious indeed. Since the early 70s the Canadian system as a whole had been suffering chronic underfunding, and the Ontario system had been especially neglected. On virtually every measure of provincial government support, the Ontario system came *dead last*. In the US the *average* level of support for publicly funded universities was 37% higher than Ontario's. The only jurisdiction receiving less public funding for its public universities was Alabama.

But did this imply that McMaster should quietly take its lumps with the rest of the system? What was McMaster's position relative to the rest of the system? At year end April 1989 the total of McMaster's trust and endowment funds amounted to \$93 million, placing McMaster firmly among the wealthiest universities in the province with an operating surplus in the vicinity of \$10 million *per annum*. Apparently the Board of Governors was unimpressed by these figures because it embarked on a vigorous programme of cost cutting.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

The Board/Senate Committee on Academic Planning (BSCAP) was responsible for guiding the process of finding ways of reducing costs to the University's budgets. It was linked to the same process going on in the Faculties. The cuts affected research directions, space, computing facilities and library holdings and acquisitions. BSCAP invited University-wide input at a series of workshops held in October and November and invited reports from Faculty Deans to be submitted by

November 15. With the material gleaned from the process, BSCAP was to make recommendations to Senate and the Board of Governors for a 10-year strategic plan to be completed by December 1990.

PENSION CONTRIBUTION HOLIDAYS

The Contributory Pension Plan for Salaried Employees of McMaster University Including the Divinity College requires that both the University and its salaried employees contribute to the Plan according to a defined formula. The Administration and the Board of Governors saw the large surplus in the pension fund as a source of cash to help offset the damaging effects of government underfunding. In July 1989 the surplus as stated by the University actuary was \$64.3 million. At that point the Administration stopped contributing to the Plan. By July 1990 the surplus had declined to \$31.8 million. The nearly 50% decline in the surplus was due only in small part to the \$6 million contribution holiday. Over the same period weakening market conditions reduced the yield on investments, and there was an increase in the cost of providing benefits.

Many faculty members saw the failure of the Administration to contribute to the pension fund as a breach of trust. There was also the concern that, while the impact of the year-long holiday was small in comparison to the other factors at work, a continuing decline in the economy combined with a continuation of the Administration's failure to contribute could in time seriously endanger the solvency of the Plan.

Litigation on the Pension “Holiday” Issue. These considerations led the Association, on 22 March 1990, to file an affidavit in the Supreme Court of Ontario initiating a suit against the Administration for failing to make its required contributions to the pension fund. We were joined in the suit by the McMaster University Staff Association, the McMaster University Clinical Faculty Association and the McMaster University Professional Librarians Association. All agreed to contribute to the legal costs. In addition there were generous contributions from retirees and from the faculty and staff associations of other universities.

The court set a date of 25 September 1990 to hear arguments from both sides. Shortly before that date we were informed that the Administration had petitioned the court for an adjournment. The petition was denied, but this action caused a delay beyond the September date and a new date was set at December 10.

The Administration began to employ tactics which could be interpreted as discouraging to the faculty, or, perhaps, as frankly hostile. An example occurred at a meeting I attended with President Geraldine Kenney-Wallace and A. L. Darling, Vice-President (Administration), regarding the implications of paragraph 164 in the Administration's affidavit sworn by Mr. Darling before the court, in which the Tripartite Agreement³⁵ was referred to as a “Protocol”, and described as a “...resolution of the Board which may be **amended** or **rescinded** at any time” (my emphasis). I explained that the only reasonable interpretation of the paragraph was as an attempt to undermine the status of the Tripartite Agreement. I warned the President that if this was her intent, and it became known to faculty, she could expect a very strong reaction. If it was not her intent, I suggested that the President, the Chair of the Board and the President of the Association enter into a joint statement reaffirming their commitment to the Joint Committee Agreement. I offered a draft statement, approved by our lawyer, as follows:

³⁵The “Tripartite Agreement” by which the Board of Governors, Senate and Faculty Association established the “Joint Committee” named below.

The Board of Governors, the Administration and the Faculty Association of McMaster University reaffirm that the composition, purposes and terms of reference of the *Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee to Consider University Financial Matters and to Discuss and Negotiate Matters Related to Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty*, as agreed to by the parties in 1984 and revised in 1987 and 1988, remains in force and is a binding contract among the parties, unless and until it is amended or terminated by mutual agreement of the parties.

Other meetings (not always civil) resulted in the following text which was signed by Glen Chambers, Chair of the Board, President Kenney-Wallace, and me:

Regardless of the outcome of the pending court case and while the case is before the Ontario Court of Justice, we reaffirm that we intend to operate under the terms of the Tripartite Agreement.

It was not what we wanted. It could be dangerous in court as it failed to define the terms fully and it seemed to be time limited. But we felt it was the best we would get under the circumstances.

Attempts to Achieve an Out-of-Court Settlement. Under the impetus of Daphne Maurer, then Past-President and Chair of the Pension Committee, a working group was established to try to develop an alternative dispute resolution mechanism. E. A. Taylor, Chair of the Board Finance Committee, attended many of the meetings of this group. The first two meetings went well and there seemed to be room for compromise. The agenda was confined to defining the non-controversial items in the Association's list of objections to the 1990 Text. Professor Maurer and A. L. Darling met during the week of February 18 to agree on the necessary revisions. The new text was sent to the Presidents of the litigant Associations, and for approval to the Joint Committee, the Pension Trust Committee, the Board Finance Committee and the Board. The atmosphere at the third meeting was amicable but, as the agenda moved on to matters more central to the dispute, the Administration appeared to be retreating to less flexible positions.

With advice from the actuaries, various amendments of the current Plan and alternative structures which might avoid the issues in dispute were discussed:

- a. An agreement on the level of surplus that would provide a cushion and room for benefit improvements was discussed. There would be a shared formula thereafter with agreement on how the surplus can be used, such as benefit improvements, holidays on both sides, etc. Governance would be shared 50/50 with a procedure for resolving disputes. With this proposal, the past would have to be dealt with, but otherwise we might be willing to share the surplus. Any new pension committee must have a link to the Joint Committee.
- b. A plan which would allow the sharing of unfunded liabilities and governance shared 50/50. Such a scheme might make it possible to agree about the past.
- c. Target Benefit Plan with level premium funding and 50/50 governance. In this system, a benefit is defined and costed over a period far into the future. A level premium is determined which, under agreed actuarial assumptions, would be sufficient to fund the target benefit. No surplus or unfunded liability is identified. If the target cannot be met, the benefit for active members of the Plan will be reduced. Thus the members share the risk which justifies the shared governance. The actuaries said that the likelihood of failure to meet the target is low as a Pension Committee with equal representation oversees the Plan and adjusts the rate of contributions based on

experience. Contribution on either side or both sides may be adjusted. In this system, indexation could be a problem unless it has been prefunded. There are also some difficulties with benefit improvements as rates of contribution must be renegotiated. Because risk is shared, contributions are fixed, and surpluses and deficits are avoided, the Board would find this model attractive.

- d. Fixed Ratio Contribution Plan. If we are not given 50/50 governance, then this proposal would not be acceptable. The scheme still allows the Pension Plan to become a “piggy bank”.

Meanwhile the surplus in the fund continued to decline. By the end of September, the value of the fund had declined by a further \$27.8 million. Using conservative assumptions and given the continued decline in market conditions, and a continued contribution holiday, the surplus was expected to have vanished by December 1.

On December 10, 1990 a group of prominent members of faculty consisting of Lorraine Allan, Derek Ford, Louis Greenspan, Leslie King and Alan Walker approached president Kenney-Wallace to urge her to take a new initiative approach toward achieving an internal settlement of the pension dispute. On 12 December, Professors Ford and Allan introduced a motion in Senate making a similar request of the President. The motion passed unanimously. On January 11, 1991 Dr. Maurer and I met with the President to give her our views on the composition and terms of an *ad hoc* working group which would be most likely to reach an out-of-court settlement. On February 14, the President announced the establishment of the working group which included representatives of the Plan members, the Administration, and a professional facilitator. During the six weeks before the court date, the group met fourteen times. They reached agreement on three non-controversial issues, but failed to agree on the substantive issues: an effective voice for members in the governance of the plan; restoration of the “holiday” money and/or significant benefit improvements; stable and moderate rates of contribution by the University; risk shared by members in proportion to shared governance.

By the end of March, after many meetings of the working group and four specific proposals, one from Mr. Darling, one from MUFA, one from the President, we were close to the end and the court date was upon us. Without much hope, Dr. Maurer and I offered a final proposal. It placed the power of decision in matters of benefit levels and rates of contribution in the hands of a Pension Committee with representation from the Board/Administration, and the four member groups. This was not palatable to us because it took the power of decision out of the Joint Committee where we have access to binding arbitration. Its decisions would have to be subject to veto by member groups. Our proposal was rejected.

This brought us to April 1 — the next day we were in court. Madam Justice Donna Haley is an expert in pension law. The hearing lasted four days. The University’s lawyers spent most of their time in argument asserting its right to wind up the Plan and claim the surplus in termination — at the time that would probably have been in the range of \$150 million.

As I suppose everyone knows, we (the Association) lost the suit.

Ironically, the surplus has now grown so large it has become necessary to make a very substantial distribution to members and former members of the Plan.

General Grievance Procedure

The need for a formal grievance procedure had been recognized among faculty members for some years when, in 1989/90 under Dr. Maurer’s Presidency, the Association’s Executive Committee took

action to press for the establishment of such a process. Until that time individual members of faculty who felt aggrieved by the actions of Department Chairs, Deans or members of the Administration could only apply to the individuals who they felt had wronged them. Redress was haphazard and if the individual was unsatisfied, the only course was to try to appeal to a higher level where the individual might or might not be heard. There were many dissatisfied faculty members who, seeing no alternative, chose to take matters into their own hands. Some took action in the courts with various outcomes, often unsatisfactory, but always expensive. A few left the University for academic employments elsewhere, others resorted to the private sector, but some stood for election to the MUFA Executive Committee, and became part of the campaign to establish formal internal procedures.

In the fall of 1990, an early draft procedure which had the support of the Provost was circulated to all faculty for comment. The responses from faculty were uniformly favourable and we received much constructive and valuable comment. A further draft with amendments based on the comments we had received was approved by the MUFA Executive Committee with instructions that the draft be included as part of our remuneration brief to the Joint Committee in December.

When the draft, with faculty comments, was taken to the Joint Committee in December, Provost Art Heidebrecht announced that his Academic Advisory Committee, consisting of Deans and Vice-Presidents, had reviewed the document and identified some difficulties. In particular, they were concerned that the policy must go to Senate for approval since the academic administrators against whom most grievances would be directed were appointed by Senate and the procedure would affect their terms of appointment.

Although many of the issues grievable under the draft procedure, research leave, allocation of resources and the like, had financial implications and were beyond the vires of Senate, the Joint Committee decided that, before giving final approval for implementation, it would be appropriate to refer the draft procedure to the Senate Committee on Appointments for comment and, one would hope, a recommendation for Senate approval. Dr. Heidebrecht said he would work to obtain Senate's speedy approval.

It transpired that the Senate Appointments Committee could not agree on the need for a general grievance procedure because it was not clear that there were grievable issues which were not covered by existing procedures, or could not be covered by additional specific procedures designed to cover them. Dr. Marianne (Walters) Kristofferson, Chair of the Special Enquiries and Grievances Committee (SEGC), and I appeared before the Senate Appointments Committee on March 27. Dr. Kristofferson described a number of generic cases dealt with recently by the Association's SEGC, illustrating a variety of cases which would not be captured by current procedures, arguing cogently that there should be a University-sponsored and approved procedure for dealing with cases of legitimate grievance directed at all levels of the Administration of the University. The Committee was apparently persuaded that specific procedures which might be designed in future would not be likely to anticipate the variety of legitimate grievances which would arise in future. It approved in principle the need for a general grievance procedure and it transmitted the following motion to the April 10 meeting of Senate:

...that Senate endorse the principle that there should be a general Grievance Procedure for faculty at McMaster University and that an appropriate document be prepared (for subsequent approval by Senate) by a joint committee composed of representatives from the Senate Committee on Appointments and the McMaster Faculty Association.

The motion passed with a large majority. Obviously, the joint committee referred to in the motion is not the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee... which initiated the draft procedure. The motion does not acknowledge a role for that Joint Committee. Moreover, it is silent on the issue

of the vires of Senate in approving a measure which seems to exceed its mandate. Nevertheless, in passing the motion the Senate acknowledged the right of faculty members to redress of grievance against the actions of administrators.

I suggested in the Joint Committee that we set a small drafting committee the task of producing a first draft and proposed David Hitchcock to head it.

The General Grievance Procedure was adopted and implemented in the 1991/92 year and Ed Daniel will no doubt provide the details in his report.

Salary Anomaly Correction Procedure

The development of the Salary Anomaly Correction Procedure to deal with anomalies of long standing, was also begun in 1990/91. Many hours were spent in a reassessment of the underlying principles following the comments received on the draft circulated to faculty. It was put in the hands of a sub-committee of the Joint Committee consisting of Art Heidebrecht, Jim Johnson, Bernadette Lynn, and Wayne Lewchuk. The group prepared their final report and the procedure was implemented in the fall of 1991. Money was set aside as part of the remuneration packages of the previous two years so that adjustment would be made retroactive to July 1, 1990.

Budget Information

We asked the Administration many questions on the budgets, as we had in the past. The answers were usually forthcoming, but often incomplete. This was sometimes because the Administration did not have the information in a useful form. We argued, in negotiations, that we could not assess their protestations of poverty in the absence of information which would allow assessment of available choices. We pointed to two multi-million dollar budget items, the Development Office and Computing and Information Services (CIS), which should be subjected to careful, independent scrutiny to ensure that they are cost effective. To their credit the Administration directed the President's Budget Committee to examine the base budgets of those units in detail.

Other Items

The Joint Committee also had extensive discussions on the terms of reference for Chairs of Departments, governance procedures in the Faculty of Health Sciences, and the policy on access to one's personal files. Less progress was made on these issues.

Integration of Female Faculty

The report of the Task Force, chaired by Fred L. Hall of Geography and Civil Engineering, to develop a process for implementing the recommendations of the Report to the Status of Women Committee on the Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster was made available to all faculty. Comments were received and the implementation was well under way by the end of my term.

Professor Hall and his Committee, consisting of May Cohen, David Counts, Barbara Ferrier, Julia O'Connor, and Kenneth Redish, produced a formidable report which made a valuable contribution to life at McMaster and an important addition to the literature on Employment Equity.

The Three-Year Agreement

The first multi-year remuneration agreement at McMaster was negotiated without resort to Final Offer Selection. The agreement was ratified by the membership 247 in favour to 9 opposed. The

achievement was a tribute to my colleagues on the Joint Committee, Ed Daniel and Wayne Lewchuk. Wayne's skills and expertise were particularly valuable in the development of the details of the CP/M profile adjustment. At the time it was believed that the University as a whole would benefit from the breathing space afforded by the agreement which simplified planning and allowed Administration and Executive Committee members alike to concentrate on the deeper issues confronting the University.

Final Comments

In my year as President, I had the support of an excellent Executive Committee and many other valuable volunteers. I thank them all.

Special thanks to Daphne Maurer, who, after the intense year of her presidency, continued to apply her formidable resources of thoroughness, wisdom and intellect not only to the pension issue, but to many of the other issues confronting us that year. She was indispensable.

The final weeks of my term were marred by catastrophe. Betty May Lamb, our Executive Assistant, whose competence, wisdom, good humour, and incredible courage sustained us all, was dying. I thank Kelly McCaughey for lightening the load throughout the year, and for cheerfully stepping into the breach when Betty May was not well enough to carry on.

And finally, thanks to Phyllis DeRosa Koetting who came to us from the President's Office to become our new Executive Assistant. Her competence, intelligence and knowledge, not only of the Association, but of the University as a whole, are literally invaluable.

Ed Daniel

1991/1992

A Year of Confrontation and Disappointment

Background: This was a year of recession, of minimal increases in provincial transfers by a first-time NDP government, of legal and political conflict over the confiscation of pension fund surpluses by the University (by taking contribution holidays), of jurisdictional conflicts between the Joint Committee (where we were represented and had some control) and the Senate (where we had no representation and no control) over matters affecting policy with regard to the Terms and Conditions of Employment for Faculty including tenure and conditions under which “Restructuring” of Academic Units was to occur. We had a recently appointed University President, Dr. Geraldine Kenney-Wallace, who expected a hierarchal control to apply to University governance.

It was not a year that I remember with joy and satisfaction, but there were some positive features. We did succeed in getting agreement about procedures to improve the Status of Women Faculty and some things that MUFA initiated did come to fruition later.

Pension Surpluses: McMaster had, and still has, a Pension Plan in which money is supplied from faculty salaries (and, originally, in equal amounts by the University) to maintain an invested fund to supply defined benefits to retiring faculty, subject to negotiations. The usual alternative plan is a Money Purchase Plan in which the employee buys funds often aided by the employer, to be used later at retirement. Actuaries determine if the potential yield in the invested fund suffices to cover the calculated future demands on the fund. In the case of our fund, the actuaries calculated that there was surplus. The University determined that it had a right unilaterally and without negotiation with faculty to stop contributing their full amount to the fund; *i.e.*, they declared a contributions holiday for themselves. The justification for this by the Administration was a projected University deficit arising from the reduced transfers from the provincial government. This was also the justification used for a plan for restructuring of Academic Units (see below) to save money.

This unilateral action appeared to contravene our agreements about the fund and we launched a legal challenge in 1990. In June 1991, a decision was handed down which largely supported the position of the University, but on the recommendation of our lawyers and with the agreement of our members we appealed. Throughout we had sought a negotiated solution in which our contributions could also be diminished or higher benefits paid to retirees. The University, especially after our initial loss in court, was uninterested in any negotiation unless it was the terms of our capitulation. The appeal we launched was not decided until the next year, and we did achieve somewhat more than we had achieved in the first decision. See 1992-3 Report.

I will not attempt to explore and explain the difficult issues which faced our clinical members in the Faculty of Health Sciences over the fact that their pension contributions could not be returned to them fully because of a maximum on pensions reimbursements set by the Department of National Revenue. This issue (and others) led to the formation of a separate Clinical Faculty Association and were ultimately settled by provision of extra cash settlements to its members.

Jurisdictional Issues: One issue in the legal hearings was the status of the decisions of the Joint Committee, the negotiating body between faculty and Administration; *i.e.*, were its decisions legally binding. Eventually we won recognition of this on appeal, but this was also an issue between MUFA and the University Senate. The question was, who determined the Terms and Conditions of

Employment, and who could negotiate a Tenure Document, Grievance Procedures, Restructuring of Academic Units (in so far as they affected faculty members terms of employment) and Research Ethics and Misconduct Standards with the Administration. This and related problems were an ongoing irritant during my term. They have now been resolved, but not until after my term.

Some Useful Initiatives: As mentioned above, we set in motion a process in which the historical inequities in remuneration and advancement of female faculty were (in part) relieved. We also began the process of helping the librarians achieve more just salary settlements and promotion. This is now at the stage where librarians are equal members of our Association. Our interventions to improve the Tenure Document, Research Ethics Standards and Procedures, Grievance Procedures, clarify the status of the Joint Committee and its decisions eventually resulted in improved handling of faculty terms and conditions of employment and better procedures for negotiating them. While it was frustrating to lack the ability to resolve these during my term as President, it is gratifying to know that our goals were high and to have seen much of what we sought eventually achieved.

Colleagues on the Faculty Association Executive: Life for a President of the Faculty Association would be intolerable if he/she were not guided and helped over difficult issues by members of the Executive: Grant Smith (Past President), Daphne Maurer (Pensions Chair), David Blewett (Vice-President), Rick Hackett (Remunerations) were among those to whom I am deeply indebted, but all contributed to overcome my ignorance, my frustration and impatience and keep me on the right track.

The MUFA Office: All who have served on the Faculty Executive or participated in MUFA activities will agree that our reasonable functioning, even our survival, depend on our staff: Phyllis DeRosa-Koetting, our Executive Assistant, was the rudder that kept our ship off the many rocks which we encountered. Kelly McCaughey, our secretary, was the person who kept us realizing that there was more than the day-to-day struggles in life. Her calm in the face of everything was the antidote to encounters with University Presidents and other bureaucrats of the time.

David Blewett

1992/1993

Reflections on the McMaster University Faculty Association, 1991-1994

Perhaps the most unappealing of the many obligations of a Faculty Association is the task of negotiating with the Administration, usually annually, an agreement on salaries and benefits. When I agreed to let my name stand for the position of Vice-President in 1991, I did so knowing that, happily, a three-year agreement had just been signed. That job at least had been taken care of and I would be able to turn my attention to matters I found more congenial while, I hoped, learning how the University actually worked — something that had been puzzling me for many years. As things turned out, I was later to find myself caught up unexpectedly in the most bizarre salary negotiation that we have ever conducted.³⁶

Despite the signing in the Spring 1991 of the first multi-year agreement on salaries and benefits, relations between the Administration and the Faculty Association were at a low ebb in the Fall of 1991 and the spirit of collegiality seemed to be flickering out. The sorry situation under which the Faculty Association had found it necessary to go to court with the University over the pension dispute reflected the failure of the Joint Committee to resolve differences of this sort. This dispute, which seemed to poison relations in other areas where resolutions might more readily have been achieved, was a disagreement over how the very large surplus that had accumulated during several years of exceptionally high interest rates was to be used. In 1987 the University, which under the terms of the pension plan paid half the annual contribution (employees collectively paid the other half), began to take a pension “holiday”, that is, to use the pension surplus to pay their contribution to the plan. The Faculty Association, along with the other three Associations (of Clinical Faculty, Librarians, and Staff), took the view that as equal contributors we should share the control of the pension funds. The dispute finally came to court and on 25 June 1991 the judge brought down her decision, sustaining the action taken by the University, that is, declaring the 1987-90 pension holidays valid. On the advice of our lawyers, we decided to appeal and that Fall we asked our members to pay for the appeal by extending the already elevated mill rate (which determines the membership dues) for an extra six months. The membership was overwhelmingly in favour.

Early in September 1991, the Government announced massive cuts (\$30 million) in its transfer payments to universities, a decision that was to trigger a re-opening of our three-year agreement,³⁷ and an unwelcome return to contract negotiations. In reality, however, the negotiations that were conducted over the next several months in the Joint Committee were hardly worthy of the name. The administrative side, unwilling to contemplate anything short of a salary freeze — despite the fact that at other universities agreements were in place that were not subject to renegotiation and which included quite substantial salary increases — finally offered a paltry .05% increase across the board.

³⁶Attempting to recall the highlights of my year as President of the Faculty Association (1992-93), I found that the events of that year couldn't easily be separated from what happened in the preceding and following years (1991-2 and 1993-4), when I was first Vice-president and later Past President. I have in consequence written about all three years as a continuous span of time.

³⁷The agreement contained a clause allowing a re-opening should the provincial grant vary by less or more than 1% from the rate of inflation.

In this acrimonious atmosphere negotiations broke off. Both sides began to prepare briefs for the forthcoming arbitration. At this point, we discovered that the Administration had retained legal counsel and a labour relations expert to help them prepare their brief, and that they also wanted their legal advisers to be present at the hearing with the arbitrator. Ed Daniel, the President of MUFA, firmly resisted the suggestion that lawyers actually join the hearing, but we could not prevent the Administration from taking legal counsel. And, indeed, we were forced to consult our lawyers in order to safeguard ourselves against any clever but unsuspected legal manoeuvre.

At this juncture I wrote an account of the *Failure to Reach Agreement in the Joint Committee and its Consequences*, which was distributed to the membership on 15 April 1992. In it I listed several instances of the “scant regard” of the Administration for the Joint Committee, including their failure to support in Senate decisions and policies previously agreed to in the Joint Committee; the failure to respond to the need to resolve the overlapping jurisdiction of the Senate and the Joint Committee; the failure of the President, Dr Geraldine Kenny-Wallace, to answer letters to her written by Ed Daniel; the failure to forward important material to members of the Senate sent by the Faculty Association which outlined our objections to aspects of a proposed Policy on Research Ethics; and, most blatantly, the decision of the Vice-President (Administration) to put forward unilaterally the University’s proposals to the Government for McMaster’s share of a fund to assist the wider public sector to adjust to reduced government funding. The government policy made it clear that they expected full consultation within institutions to take place. The Association had not been consulted at all.

On a Friday afternoon, a few days after the circulation of my account of the *Failure to Reach Agreement*, I accompanied Daphne Maurer and Rick Hackett into Toronto to see our lawyers. But to our great surprise, when we reached the lawyer’s office, Michael Mitchell’s opening words were “Do you want to negotiate?”. He had had a call from the Administration’s lawyer with a renewed offer. I phoned Ed Daniel to explain the situation and to say that the three of us, though we were not at all hopeful, thought that we should see what the other side had to say. So, wholly unexpectedly, we began what turned out to be a lengthy negotiation conducted entirely by telephone and fax between the two lawyers’s offices. But by late that evening we had reached an agreement that was reasonably close to what the Association had earlier proposed and considerably better than the .05% previously offered by the Administration. The agreement was signed on 27 April and subsequently ratified by the membership. As I wrote in a report in the first newsletter in the fall our “reaction to the whole process of negotiation — weeks of no progress, eventual recourse to an arbitrator, the costly introduction of lawyers, and a negotiated settlement achieved only hours before the hearing [with the arbitrator] — was mixed. On the one hand, the process was absurdly time-consuming, not conducive to good relations, and expensive. On the other, the introduction of lawyers, acting in effect as mediators, helped both sides to achieve a settlement without recourse to arbitration. Both sides now recognize that in the future more formal mediation may have a beneficial role to play in bringing the two sides together”. A year later, on 25 March 1993, after careful consideration, the Association and the Administration jointly signed a Memorandum of Agreement to facilitate the introduction (at the request of either side) of a mediator into the negotiation process.

That year, 1991-92, was difficult in other ways because, most unfortunately and sadly, our Executive Assistant of several years, Betty May Lamb, became seriously ill with cancer and, while she struggled valiantly to keep on working, was less and less able to keep up. In the early part of 1992, Ed Daniel and I interviewed a number of applicants for the position, and hired Phyllis DeRosa Koetting, who quickly proved herself invaluable in the complicated salary negotiation that soon followed and has since streamlined the operation of the office. By 1992 the finances of the Association had fallen into a deplorable state owing to the costs of the pension dispute and the recent salary negotiations. Things were so bad that we had to arrange to pay our lawyers’s bill by monthly installments. Since then, however, thanks in part to Phyllis’s prudent management, the financial situation has improved

dramatically and we have built up a healthy reserve fund and also lowered the mill rate.

During the year in which I was President (1992-93), nothing quite so extraordinary as salary negotiations conducted from a lawyer's office high in an office tower in Toronto occurred, but a remarkable number of important and often contentious matters were dealt with by a host of committees. These included a new Research Leave Policy, a solution to the CAWAR³⁸ problem, a policy on Research Ethics, and revisions to the Tenure and Promotion document. We also struck a number of new committees to deal with such matters as Faculty Conduct, Mid/Late Career Options, Conflicts of Interest and — the first hint of things to come — a joint Senate/Faculty Association Committee to give advice on “vertical cuts,” that is, the elimination of units within the University. A significant downturn in the economy, which coincided with the determination of the Rae government to “restructure” the provincial universities, had sent out, by Spring of 1993, seismic warnings. The earthquake was to come in June 1993 when government legislation — the “Social Contract” — imposed a salary freeze on “the broader public sector,” once again destroying our multi-year salary settlement.

It was clear, given the serious reduction in government transfer payments to universities, that changes had to be made and the Provost, Art Heidebrecht, at our suggestion, set up a small committee, the Provost's Advisory Group to Initiate Change, thereafter known as PAGIC, which worked for several months and came up with a report to which the Faculty Association clearly had to respond. By this time I had become Past President and so, others appeared to think, the appropriate person to become the Chairman of the response team,³⁹ the Faculty Association PAGIC Assessment Group (FAPAG). Although we had hoped that the PAGIC, working together over the summer months, might come up with a number of imaginative suggestions for restructuring and changing the University, the PAGIC report when it appeared created a furor on campus. Not only were the proposals utilitarian and mechanistic, but two major areas — Health Sciences and the Administration — were scarcely mentioned. Arguing that faculty salaries “constitute the major portion of the budget that has not yet experienced serious reductions,” the report recommended that salaries be “lowered to five-sixths of their current level”. The idea was that most faculty would regain the remaining one-sixth of their former salaries in the form of a “research/teaching supplement”. It was not difficult to rebut arguments of this sort. Our initial position paper, which I read at a General Meeting of the Association on 6 December 1993, was unanimously endorsed by those present. In March 1994, we published a detailed rebuttal of each of the recommendations in the report directly affecting faculty. The PAGIC report died a quiet and unlamented death.

Bob Rae's government's intention of restructuring the universities had another component as we found out in October 1993, when they “adopted a policy of zero tolerance of harassment and discrimination in Ontario universities”, ignoring the fact that Ontario universities are autonomous and without a mention of academic freedom, with which such a policy was potentially in conflict in several respects. I do not doubt that good intentions, notably the worthy desire to give all young people a chance at a university education whatever their circumstances, lay behind the “Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination”. But the “Framework” itself appeared to be encouraging the very intolerance it condemned, inviting broad abuses and inappropriate complaints. Students were invited to infer a “negative environment or climate” and “innuendo” was considered “sufficient grounds of claiming harassment”. Two faculty associations, McMaster and Toronto, came

³⁸That is, faculty members, largely in Health Sciences but in some cases in Science and Engineering, on Continuing Appointment Without Annual Review, whose salary came largely or entirely from agencies outside the University. At this time, many CAWARS, finding their funding drying up, were seeking tenured appointments.

³⁹The other members were Lorraine Allan, Phyllis Granoff, Marianne Kristopherson (Walters), Wayne Lewchuk, Shep Siegel, and Susan Watt. Les King and Daphne Maurer were consultants.

out against the document and 95 faculty members at Trent University published a strongly-worded Trent Statement in opposition to it. Many individual university professors spoke up, pointing out that a genuine education was one which would challenge students to question the very notions they had been brought up with, to see new points of view, to consider ideas that might be anathema to their parents or contemporaries. In the process some students would certainly feel “offended” and “uncomfortable”. Reaction among the McMaster faculty was not uniform and we received a number of complaints over our stand against the government’s position. But the majority welcomed the strong defence of academic freedom. The opposition here and at other universities meant that the government began to retreat from their attempt to dictate what is said in the classroom, and the “Framework” was gradually forgotten. This University has reason to be proud that our Faculty Association took a lead in defending academic freedom against the attempt of the government of the day to impose their views.

Shepard Siegel

1993/1994

When I accepted the Faculty Association position I was confident that, whatever other obligations came with the Presidency, I would be spared the onerous task of remuneration negotiation. We were covered by a previously-negotiated multi-year contract. However, in June 1993, the NDP Provincial Government ruined my summer. In fact, the problems started a few months earlier. In April the government introduced many measures to reduce the provincial deficit. Funding to the universities was to be drastically cut, and the government attempted to negotiate a decrease in salaries of public sector employees (including faculty) to facilitate this action.

Discussions with public sector unions were unsuccessful (universities were represented by OCUFA). On June 14, Ontario Treasurer Floyd Laughren introduced Bill 49 — “The Social Contract Act”. This unprecedented legislation was presented in 36, single-spaced pages. Remuneration in the “broader public sector” (including universities) was to be reduced by \$2 billion. The Act was, in places, unclear (e.g., “for purposes of this Act, a subsector shall be deemed a sector”), but some hasty calculations suggested that McMaster had to save about \$7.5 million. McMaster faculty (in common with other public sector employees) had to reach an agreement by August 1 (or, by some readings of the Act, August 10). If we did, the University was rewarded with a lower expenditure target (about \$6 million). If we did not, compensation was fixed and, “if necessary to meet the expenditure reduction target established by the Minister, an employer may require employees to take unpaid leaves of absence” The Act ran for 3 years. I met with the Provost, Art Heidebrecht, early in the morning on June 16. We agreed on the immediate implication of Bill 49 — we needed lots of meetings. There were, in fact, virtually continuous meetings with the MUFA Remuneration Committee, Executive Committee, Joint Committee, and OCUFA.

I chaired an “extraordinary meeting” of MUFA on June 24 to provide information about Bill 49 to the membership. It was the best-attended general meeting that I have seen — either before or since. As I indicated at that meeting, “we are trying to act in accordance with legislation that is hastily prepared and ambiguously worded....Bill 49 gives great discretionary power to the Minister of Finance, and any discussion of the Bill must be based on certain assumptions concerning the behaviour of the Minister, given certain scenarios.” Although I study behaviour for a living, I did not find my skills valuable here.

Our Joint Committee Agreement was not compatible with the imposed deadlines, but nevertheless the Joint Committee did manage to get an agreement by the mandated deadline. Our Remuneration Chair, Wayne Lewchuk, did an extraordinary job of piloting MUFA in these uncharted waters.

To deal with the fiscal crisis, the Provost convened the *Provost’s Advisory Group to Initiate Change*. Chaired by Provost Heidebrecht, PAGIC also included Susan French, Fred L. Hall, Alan Harrison, Peter Sutherland, and Alexander Darling (as a consultant). The PAGIC report was widely discussed in forums of students, faculty, and staff. I particularly remember a headline in the *Silhouette* — “Do You Believe in PAGIC?” I wished I had thought of that for the *MUFA Newsletter*. The formal MUFA response was presented in a report by the *Faculty Association PAGIC Assessment Group* (FAPAG). The FAPAG Committee was chaired by David Blewett, and consisted of Lorraine Allan, Les King, Marianne Kristofferson, Phyllis Granoff, Wayne Lewchuk, and me. The preliminary FAPAG report was presented at the December 6, 1993 meeting of the Faculty Association, and the final report was distributed on March 9, 1994. It would be interesting to go over the PAGIC report and FAPAG response, and see how the University has, or has not, changed in ways that were recommended.

The NDP government had a political, as well as a fiscal agenda for universities. They released a “Framework” putatively concerning harassment and discrimination in Ontario universities. It was an Orwellian newspeak document containing much of the “zero-tolerance” rhetoric that was fashionable at that time. The more odious implications of the “Framework” document were recognized by some faculty at Trent University, who published the “Trent Statement on Free Enquiry and Expression” as a response to the government’s “Framework”. At their February 24, 1994 meeting, the MUFA Executive endorsed the “Trent Statement”. As a result of the Executive’s action, one long-time MUFA member resigned, and one long-time MUFA non-member joined. The action stirred a debate on academic freedom that culminated in a well-attended presentation by Robert Fulford the following year (for more information on this issue, see Lorraine Allan’s submission below).

An enduring problem during my term as President was the CAWAR issue. It continued into the term of the next President, Lorraine Allan, and is discussed in her report.

The MUFA membership voted to approve some changes to our By-laws and Constitution. We wished to maintain the voluntary nature of our organization, yet had a real problem. Some faculty joined the Association only when they needed the most time-consuming and expensive benefits of membership (e.g., legal assistance). We took steps to decrease such abuse.

It has, of course, been many years since I was actively involved in the Faculty Association. In my final report to the MUFA membership I said:

In my year as President, and my two years on the Joint Committee, my opinion of the concept of collegiality would very much depend on the day that you asked my opinion. I am very pleased to say that, at the end of my term, I am returning to the enthusiasm for collegiality that I had at the beginning of my term. As a result of the massive increase in the pension plan surplus, we are now discussing things that were not really on the table before. We do not yet have a jointly-managed MUFF, but we are taking important steps in assuring that the pension plan members have input into the ways the growing surplus may be used to ameliorate the effects of the fiscal crisis.

I am, of course, gratified that, subsequently MUFF (McMaster University Futures Fund) became a reality, and the “growing surplus” issue is likely to be resolved soon.

Lorraine Allan

1994/1995

When I think back to the year of my Presidency, the first thing that pops into my head is the dreaded C word — CAWAR, the acronym for Continuing Appointment without Annual Review. CAWAR is a full-time appointment at McMaster which is the same as a tenured appointment except for the salary source. CAWARs are supported, in whole or in substantial part, by funds external to the operating budget of the University, and the continuation of the appointment is contingent on the continuation of the external salary funds. In the mid 90s external grants were shrinking in number with the result that many CAWARs were losing their funding and potentially their McMaster appointments. What was McMaster's obligation to these faculty who had importantly contributed to the educational and research activities of the University? While some CAWARs who had lost their funding were reappointed as tenured faculty, there were frequent complaints to MUFA, informal and formal, that there was no policy in place to guide such decisions. The CAWAR reappointment process appeared arbitrary and unfair. The MUFA Executive was instrumental in placing the CAWAR issue before Senate by insisting that Senate establish joint Faculty Association/Senate Committees (little j committees) to address the various CAWAR issues. Two committees were struck. The *CAWAR Re-Evaluation Committee* was concerned with possible revisions to the CAWAR category of appointment for **future** appointments to McMaster. The *Ad Hoc CAWAR Committee* was concerned with the fate of existing CAWARs when their external funding ceases. I am not naïve enough to believe that the CAWAR problem has been totally solved, but I do know that the associated problems have been reduced. More recent MUFA presidents have not been plagued with CAWAR nightmares.

Looking back through the various updates I wrote to the MUFA membership during my Presidency, I was reminded of the short and insignificant life-span of most government reports. In 1994/1995, the Minister of Training and Education received recommendations on university funding from the Ontario Council on University Affairs (OCUA) — an advisory body to the Ontario government on policy relating to the province's university-level institutions. In November 1993, Minister David Cooke had instructed OCUA to “conduct a review of the funding system for the universities of Ontario”. In August 1994, OCUA released a Discussion Paper, *Sustaining Quality in Changing Times: Funding Ontario Universities*. Three funding models were proposed in the Discussion Paper. Two of these models are modifications to the existing funding system. The third model, “Purchaser of Service System”, proposed a new system where universities would enter into contracts with the government for specific services and levels of performance in exchange for public funding. This model would have dramatically changed the Ontario university system. There was rejection of this funding model from all. There was constant and consistent criticism of OCUA for abrogating their buffer role and collaborating with the government. OCUA is dead and *Sustaining Quality in Changing Times: Funding Ontario Universities* is gathering dust with other such funding reports. And new government reports are being generated as we speak!

The Ontario government was pretty active (intrusive) with regard to universities in the mid-90s. One month before instructing OCUA to investigate refinancing of universities, the Ministry of Education and Training released their *Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities*. The *Framework* was perceived by many, non-academics as well as academics, as a potential threat to academic freedom. One of the earliest and strongest responses was the Trent statement “on Free Enquiry and Expression”. The 1993-94 MUFA Executive (when I was Vice President), after examining the *Framework* document, agreed with the critics of the document and endorsed the Trent statement. We were praised and supported by some faculty, criticized and condemned by others. The debate, which persisted at McMaster for many months,

resulted in the MUFA Human Rights Committee sponsoring a forum In January 1995, open to all members of the McMaster community, on *Academic Freedom and its Limits*. There were two invited participants, Dr. Charles Pascal (Deputy Minister of Education) and Dr. Robert Fulford (journalist and Doctor of Laws from McMaster in 1986). Dr. Pascal was supposed to defend the Ontario Government *Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities*. He cancelled at the last moment. Dr. Fulford defended academic freedom. His lecture was printed in the February 1995 MUFA newsletter. What happened to the *Framework*? Thankfully it was buried!

University policy, government funding, and academic freedom. Such matters are central to the functioning of a university and therefore central to MUFA. We are lucky at McMaster that MUFA continues to enjoy a “collegial” relationship with the Administration and is represented on Senate through its Observer status. We easily strike *ad hoc* joint committees with Senate to deal with policy matters, we are often on the same side as the Administration with regard to government intervention, and we still enjoy academic freedom.

Peter George

President & Vice-Chancellor (Professor of Economics)

1995-2005

I am delighted to send my warmest personal greetings to the McMaster University Faculty Association on the occasion of your 50th anniversary.

Working together in the best of collegial traditions to advance the academic mission of McMaster, the University and MUFA have created many policies and procedures over the years, which have benefitted both faculty members and the entire University community.

The collegial approach has served McMaster well, and I am committed to continue to look for ways to work together for the greater good of McMaster.

Personally, I have enjoyed my relationship with the several MUFA Presidents with whom I have served during my term as University President, and I look forward to continuing our excellent relations in the future.

Again, my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to MUFA. Cheers!

Henry Jacek

1995/1996

The Executive Committee for 1995/96 took office on April 25th, 1995 and served until April 22nd 1996. During that eventful year, MUFA had two fundamental organizational changes and negotiated one collective agreement. In addition, the transition of the University Presidency from Geraldine Kenney-Wallace to Peter George on July 1, 1995 meant a considerable amount of time needed to be devoted to establishing working procedures between Peter and MUFA. Finally, the election of the Provincial Conservative government of Mike Harris on June 8, 1995 and the consequent cuts to McMaster's budget led to major new University policies. These occupied a large amount of the Executive's time and attention both on the substance of the policies and the process by which they were designed and implemented.

The End of Faculty Free Riders

During the course of the 1990s, collective bargaining and dispute resolution at McMaster became more complex and as a result MUFA's costs of representing faculty in salary, benefit, pension, grievance and other matters increased. MUFA represented all faculty in its negotiations with the Administration regarding salary, benefits and conditions of employment. However, the costs were borne by about two-thirds of faculty on the CP/M scheme who regularly paid MUFA dues.

Even worse, as faculty salaries failed to keep pace with the Consumer Price Index, and as the Administration would not fully fund our CP/M plan, more and more faculty opted to compensate for these trends by cutting expenditures including MUFA dues. As a result, a small, significant and growing minority of faculty were making no contribution to MUFA, but reaping its benefits. Between 1992 and 1995 MUFA's total nominal income dropped. It was reasonable to expect dramatic declines in the near future accompanied with deficits and declining services. The very existence of MUFA might be in danger in future years.

Consequently, MUFA and the Administration agreed to a motion that would make payment of MUFA dues, the Rand formula, a condition of faculty employment at McMaster. At the time such an arrangement was in place at the University of British Columbia and at the Ontario College of Art and Design. All faculty members, whether MUFA members or not, were allowed to vote on this item and as a result the motion passed by a strong majority. This new rule, coupled with the Joint Committee process and the final offer selection resolution of remuneration disputes, became known as the McMaster model of Administration-Faculty relations.

Remuneration of Faculty

MUFA negotiated one remuneration agreement in 1995/1996. It was a one-year agreement. The most important aspect was an attempt to compensate faculty for the negative consequences of the three-year Social Contract freeze on faculty remuneration which laid a heavy burden especially on younger faculty. The reason for this was the suspension of the CP/M plan during the Social Contract period which ended at the end of March 1996. Accordingly the MUFA bargaining team, under the skilled leadership of Wayne Lewchuk, was able to extract with hard bargaining a restoration of most of the faculty increments temporarily lost in this period. Fortunately, the rest were reinstated in later contracts. In addition the agreement also included a Memorandum of Agreement re benefits, and limitations on the Administration's ability to assign teaching duties in the twilight (5:30-6:20) hour. The agreement was approved by the membership, 172-32.

Subsequently, on average a faculty member saw her or his salary increase nominally by 2.45 per cent on July 1, 1996. In addition there were improvements to the indexing of faculty pensions, a reduction in premiums for out-of-province medical insurance and a reimbursement of costs for going online to the University computer system from home. The MUFA agreement clearly showed that it is possible to leave salary structures intact and preserve career increments despite the initial distorting effects of the Social Contract. I think most members were pleased that MUFA was able to negotiate a sound agreement which recovered most of the ground lost because of the Social Contract.

Welcome Academic Librarians

In 1995/1996 MUFA enthusiastically made a decision to accept professional librarians as full members. The previously existing McMaster University Professional Librarians Association (MUPLA) was asked by MUFA to encourage its members to join MUFA. Clearly MUFA wanted academic recognition conferred on the University's librarians. At most Ontario universities, librarians belonged to faculty associations so McMaster was atypical in this regard. Elise Hayton became the first librarian to serve on the MUFA Executive, effective September 1995.

What a Way to Begin a MUFA Year — In Walked Mike Harris

On June 8, 1995 the voters in the Ontario general election gave a strong majority to PC leader Mike Harris. His election had an immediate negative impact on the University which greatly compounded the difficulties in establishing a working relationship between MUFA and the new University president. This electoral decision would result in a dramatic drop in faculty compensation and numbers and in the quality and quantity of both research and teaching at McMaster and the other Ontario universities.

Welcome, Peter George

On July 1, 1995 economics professor Peter George became President of McMaster University. On the first working day of his term, July 4, 1995 a campus breakfast outside the main entrance doors of the Mills Library was organized to celebrate Peter's assumption of office. As the President of MUFA, I was pleased to give the keynote greetings to the new University President. Included in my remarks, I noted that, "For the first time in our generation, this University, like all others in Canada and Ontario, faces severe reductions in support from both the federal government in Ottawa and the provincial government at Queen's Park". I continued, "Our mutual goals will be to maintain the quality of education, indeed to improve it if we can, and to maintain the quality and quantity of research that has made McMaster a world class research University". I ended by saying, "Once again, congratulations, Peter. We pledge our support". In return Peter remains a member in good standing of MUFA down to the present day and continues to remit to MUFA the largest single individual dues payment.

The Cuts Begin

On July 21, 1995 the Ontario government announced a surprise in-year cut of \$16.8 million to Ontario's universities. For McMaster that was a cut of almost \$1 million which had not been planned for in any way. One year later the Ontario government made a cut to McMaster's operating budget of \$17,259,000: compared to the 1995/1996 allocations, this was a cut of 15.3%. For the university system as a whole, it was a cut of over \$284 million. Between 1995 and 2000, Ontario's universities were subject to a cumulative cut of over \$1.4 billion. Cuts of this magnitude immediately threw every Ontario university, including McMaster, into a serious deficit position.

The Immediate Solution — The Early Retirement Programme for Faculty

In order to deal with the financial crisis created by the Harris government, the University Administration developed an early retirement programme for faculty in late 1995. The basic operating principles included the view that the massive cuts should be absorbed as quickly as possible and that the key way to do this was by a dramatic reduction in core faculty and academic librarians. The Finance Committee of the Board of Governors received details of the Administration proposal on January 3, 1996 and approved it on January 9. It was then brought to the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee on January 10.

This entire process produced a procedural conflict between Peter George and MUFA. By the end of November 1995, MUFA found out that the Administration was developing an early retirement package for faculty. The problem was that this package was being developed without any participation by the Faculty Association. On December 15, I wrote to Peter George and expressed our concern with the lack of formal consultation between the Administration and MUFA.

Peter replied on December 18 that he would consult with the Joint Committee once the package was drafted and before it was finalized for presentation to the Finance Committee. However, the package was sent to the Finance Committee and discussed there before the package came to the Joint Committee. On January 5, I wrote back to Peter George and pointed out that the Joint Committee should discuss in an exploratory way the general outlines of the possible policy before there was any crystallization of policy. I also pointed out that the Joint Committee should approve the policy text before it went to either the Senate or the Board of Governors and its committees. It was embarrassing to say the least for the MUFA Executive to admit ignorance of the details in response to the many inquires from individual faculty members.

The package itself was offered only to the faculty on the CP/M scheme. Those faculty 60 years of age or less were offered \$2,000 per year of service. An annual bridging payment to age 65 was also offered up to a maximum of \$8,725 per year. Life insurance was also covered to age 65. Additional benefits included continuation of major medical and dental coverage, free campus parking, membership in the Ivor Wynne Recreation Centre, free tuition for member and spouse and half price membership in the Faculty Club. Forty-eight faculty members took advantage of the early retirement offer out of 732 total McMaster core faculty.

Hamilton Days of Action

Concerned about the impact of the PC government's cutbacks on higher education, the MUFA Executive encouraged members to participate in the Hamilton Days of Action protest in any way they considered suitable. These Days of Action were held on February 23 & 24, 1995 to protest the severe cuts to public services in the Province of Ontario by the new PC government of Mike Harris. These days were chosen to coincide with the Ontario PC policy conference in Hamilton.

MUFA decided to use a two track strategy to communicate our message that the cutbacks to university education in Ontario were wrong. First, it encouraged its members to march in the street protests. Second, MUFA decided to send a delegate, its OCUFA Director, Dr. William Smyth, then Chair of the Department of Computer Science, to the PC conference. Bill was charged to distribute inside the conference a leaflet advocating quality university education and research, and financial accessibility to universities. This leaflet was produced by a committee headed by David Hitchcock, the Executive Committee member in charge of human rights.

In order to highlight MUFA's concerns and our double strategy, a news release was composed and a press conference was held on February 21, 1995. A good turnout of print and electronic media appeared to hear my presentation and to ask me questions. Both the leaflet and news release were given to the media. In addition, in the MUFA board room I, as Faculty Association President, and

University President Peter George signed a huge "Education is Common Sense" banner that was circulating among Ontario universities to protest the Harris government education cuts. The banner, which was presented in the legislature in April, was brought to the MUFA press conference to collect signatures from the McMaster University community. The banner signing provided the two presidents with yet another opportunity to convey to the Harris government the negative impact of education cuts on university students and their futures, and on the economic and social health of the province. A photograph of the joint signing was widely produced in the print media and led to some criticism of Peter George by business people and Conservative Party members on the McMaster University Board of Governors.

MUFA was not the only employee group in the education sector to follow a two track approach to the Tory policy convention. The Ontario Teachers Federation was inside and provided delegates with a hospitality suite no less. Bill Smyth participated in a breakout session on colleges and universities. More importantly, Bill gave out 700 of the MUFA brochures developed by David Hitchcock, Les Robb, Valerie Parke and Bob Johnston. Four main points were expressed in the brochure: universities are an investment; Ontario's universities are efficient; universities should be accessible; and quality is important. These points were supported by charts, one of them showing that in 1995/1996 the average Ontario student paid \$2800 in fees, fourth highest in Canada, behind Alberta at \$3300 and Nova Scotia at \$3200. Bill met the premier who said "I know that brochure — it's the one that says we have to catch up with Nova Scotia." Good charts are one thing, interpretation is another. (This paragraph borrows information and language directly from Bill Smyth, "The View from Inside", *MUFA NEWSLETTER*, 22.5, March, 1996, pp. 2-4.)

The outside group demonstrated on both the 23rd and 24th. On the first day McMaster faculty assembled in Westdale and marched to the main marshaling area around Dundurn Park — a fitting spot to honour the memory of that arch Tory, Sir Allan McNab. A large maroon and grey banner, "McMaster Faculty for Social Justice," was carried by Gary Warner and Don Wells, who I believe made the banner. Other faculty in the group included George Sorger, who would later speak for us at our rally at Copps Coliseum to rousing cheers, Kenneth Chan, Atif Kubursi, Graeme MacQueen and myself, and others. At Dundurn Park we were joined by Bill Coleman, Charlotte Yates and Wayne Lewchuk among others. The next day the faculty met at Pier 4 and took part in an impressive march of 100,000 people immediately alongside members of MUSA and nurses from the Ontario Nurses Association. (For a more detailed and lively description of the outside faculty marchers see George Sorger, "The View from Outside" pp. 1-2 in the above *MUFA NEWSLETTER*).

Of my 34 years at McMaster, 1995/1996 gave me more satisfaction than any other. The Executive, the members and staff constantly supported me beyond all my expectations, which were high to begin with. I learned a great deal from the careful mentoring of immediate Past-President Lorraine Allan. I was fortunate to have an outstanding Vice-President in Les Robb. Both Lorraine and Les knew so much about how the University operates that I never felt ignorant. It was knowledge-by-proxy, what lifelines! Wayne Lewchuk was forced to lead us through two negotiations; the main one was successful, but a preliminary three month coming-out-of-Social Contract one went to an unsuccessful final offer selection process. Louis Greenspan had a very busy year with special enquiries & grievances but he attacked the work with his well-known gusto. Sherman Cheung provided us with good advice on pension matters and Willi Wiesner performed well as treasurer. Bob Johnston handled public relations and as editor of the *MUFA NEWSLETTER* produced an informative and attractive monthly publication.

David Pengelly handled membership concerns and made many pleasant contributions to our Executive meetings. Anna St Leger Lucas dealt with our tenure issues carefully and Fred L. Hall was on top of our academic affairs including nominations for OCUFA teaching and library awards. I previously mentioned the major contributions of David Hitchcock to human rights and our political brochure and Bill Smyth as OCUFA Director and our inside representative at the PC policy

convention. David Santry ensured our elections were handled properly. Elise Hayton and Valerie Parke split the yearly duties as library director and helped educate faculty on issues we are generally unaware of in the University libraries.

I was constantly amazed at how much support we received from our members. They always seemed to think we were making the correct decision. Especially startling to me was the deference given to my judgment by our members even when I wasn't sure I was doing the right thing.

Finally, I am sure the other MUFA presidents over the last decade have already expressed my next views, but I hope I can be the most enthusiastic of all. Phyllis DeRosa-Koetting and Kelly McCaughey are simply amazing. What a pleasure it was for me to come into the MUFA office every day. So many people contributed so much to make 1995/1996 a proud year for MUFA, but the contributions of Phyllis and Kelly stand out overall.

Les Robb

1996/1997

On this occasion I would like to be able to write about the earth shattering events that took place during my Presidency and how they changed the University for evermore. Unfortunately, if I were to write of such things, there are some around who would quickly realize that it was a fiction. Seldom does anything substantial happen within a single year. Things percolate along over longer periods of time and many of the things that coalesced during my Presidency had their roots in earlier times.

To be sure, looking over past *Newsletters* and Executive minutes reminds me it was a very busy time, but hardly tumultuous. It did start the ball rolling on the pension surplus distribution which looks as if it will be an important milestone, but it has taken another four years to get to the stage where we can really see this is going to happen. More on that below.

As I am supposed to provide some historical perspective in this note, I outline here the key activities during my Presidency and try to indicate their origins. I also provide my current perspective on them.

A **review of OCUFA** was underway, spearheaded by Western and Queen's who were threatening to withdraw their support from the organization. Much of the unhappiness with OCUFA had to do with the personnel at the OCUFA office. Eventually new committees were struck, new modes of operation were found and some changeover in the administration at OCUFA was achieved. Hank Jacek as MUFA's Past President and OCUFA representative played an important role in these deliberations.

Librarians had joined MUFA the previous year, but we had not yet been able to get an agreement with the Administration on terms and conditions of employment and recognition of academic status. Much of the year was spent in discussions with the Administration about these issues and though we made considerable progress, finishing the job was one that I passed on to my successors. I enjoyed spending time with our team in these discussions and especially benefited from the input of the librarians on the team, Liz Bayley and Carl Spadoni.

The **Special Early Retirement Programme** had been instituted the previous fall as an Administration initiative. It was estimated to cost \$4 million and the University, as part of Directions II (the second coming of the University plan), had proposed that this be paid out of the Pension Plan; that is, out of the surplus. The Plan members, through their representatives, took the view that if the University wanted \$4 million to pay for this University expense, then the members wanted \$4 million in Plan improvements. After lengthy negotiations, that is indeed what happened. While there were statements made by individuals on both sides of the table that this agreement did not set a precedent for future discussions about pension surplus, in retrospect it clearly did. This idea of equally sharing the surplus took root with the Plan member representatives and played an important role in our thinking about the current Surplus Sharing Agreement. Doug Welland and I represented MUFA in these discussions.

Following the agreement on the Special Early Retirement program there remained some confusion about what it meant to retire from McMaster. MUFA had negotiated a variety of retirement benefits in addition to pensions including health and dental benefits, parking, office space for retirees, and so on. The boom of the stock market in the 1990s made it attractive for individuals taking early retirement to take the **cash option in the Pension Plan** rather than a continuing McMaster pension. Somehow, the University Administration took the view that these individuals would lose all the benefits if they took the cash option. Working through the Joint Committee, we were able to convince the Administration that these were rights that did not disappear simply because an individual chose to take his or her pension in a particular form.

The collapse of funding to the University sector that had prompted the early retirement scheme applied to the health care sector as well. One consequence of this was the non-renewal of funding for many of our colleagues on soft money in the Health Sciences Faculty. The **CAWAR** (continuing appointment without annual review) problem became a major issue during the year. This problem took the form that various individuals on CAWAR contracts had promises, or believed they did, that if their funding dried up they would be moved into tenured appointments. Some of these promises were in writing by people who had the authority to make the promises, some were in writing by individuals who did not have the authority to make such a promise (for example, a department chair), and others were verbal promises that were difficult to substantiate. Sorting out who had legitimate claims to a tenured position as soon as one opened up was an immense challenge. The policy issues were a frequent topic in the Joint Committee, but, much of the work was carried out in private by the Special Enquiries and Grievances Committee (Les King and Jackie Roberts) who did an outstanding job on this issue.

1996/97 was a **negotiating year** and we succeeded in coming to agreement on salaries without going to final offer arbitration. As always with these things, negotiations went down to the wire. I was joined on the Joint Committee by Catherine Beattie and Bernadette Lynn. Phyllis [DeRosa-Koetting] reports that she can remember the two of them brow beating me in the MUFA offices till we finally reached agreement. An important result was an agreement to restore all the CP/M payments that had been lost during the Social Contract and had not yet been made up. We were one of the few faculty associations in the province, if not the only one, to negotiate this restoration.

During this year MUFA gained **official observer status on Senate and on the Board of Governors**. It was an important development and one that set MUFA apart from most other faculty associations in the province. It means that MUFA gets agendas in advance and may speak on any issue without having to seek special permission. As well, it means our representative may attend closed sessions, whereas visitors may not. While these are important developments in principle, they have been less significant for MUFA than for other campus groups who were given observer status as well. MUFA has generally made sure that someone from the Executive was nominated to both Board and Senate to provide the kind of links that observer status gives us. In fact, it should be acknowledged that the main push to gain observer status came from others, especially the student groups who often found themselves on the outside when it came to Board and Senate.

Just to complete the record, **other items** that occupied considerable time during this year included: a suspension policy, a charter of rights for students, public release of teaching evaluations, a patent and intellectual property policy, a review of employment accommodation as per the Federal Contractors Programme, and changes to the Tenure and Promotion document.

As I noted at the outset, progress for MUFA often is a slow and continuing process. Since leaving the Presidency I have been involved, far more than I ever expected or intended, in the Pension Surplus Distribution Proposal (or perhaps I can now say “Agreement” as we are, at this writing, in the final stages of this process). Sometimes the involvement has been more demanding and more intense than anything I saw as President. This is not a unique experience. Many of the Past Presidents of MUFA continue to play an important role for MUFA and continue to give advice (when asked) to current Presidents and/or Executives. It works the way a good organization should. Part of the reason it works so well, of course, is the excellent staff we have had over the years. There is no office in the University better staffed than MUFA. To end with one telling story, individuals who become closely associated with the MUFA Office are always amazed to find out how often the MUFA staff get calls from Deans, Vice Presidents, and other senior administrators to find out about a policy or procedure at McMaster. They know where to turn for the answer.

Catherine Beattie

1997/1998

I think of MUFA first as a congenial and dedicated group of people. During my term as President I worked closely with many of those people and benefited enormously from their advice. I also think of MUFA as an institution designed to protect the interests of McMaster's faculty; this is my main topic here.

In dealing with most of the issues which arose during my term, I was able to rely upon an existing democratic and efficient system. One issue stands out as a noteworthy exception. The unfolding of events in that case forced me to recognize that our democratic processes are constantly under threat and require alert and articulate defenders at all times.

Traditionally at McMaster, "faculty interests" have been interpreted very broadly; they extend to such things as the physical appearance of the campus. Questions of where to locate new buildings thus engage faculty, and so MUFA.

In 1997, a decision had to be made about where to locate a new student centre. Not only the site for the centre, but also the process for choosing it were the most controversial issues of the year for faculty, and for other members of the campus community. They also became issues for the local citizenry, the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee, Hamilton's Planning and Development Department, and ultimately the City Council.⁴⁰

I am writing this early in 2001; the skeleton of the new student centre, now officially named "McMaster University Student Centre", dominates the Sterling Street approach to the campus. I have no doubt that the site of the building, between Gilmour Hall and Mills Library, is a far better choice than the one very nearly forced through in the face of fierce opposition. There are lessons to be learned from the process by which the original plan was foiled.

Five sites were put forth by a small committee appointed by the President of the University in the summer of 1997. But it quickly became apparent that one site had been pre-selected. It was designated "Option C". Many faculty responded to the choice with disbelief. No wonder. For the proposal was to demolish the Alumni Memorial Hall and appropriate its site and the adjacent green space for the Centre. Farewell to the quiet area enclosed by McMaster's historic buildings. Farewell to the splendid southern and western views of the Niagara Escarpment which form a backdrop to the historic core. Farewell to the fine building erected to the memory of McMaster students and graduates killed in the two World Wars, home to the Faculty Club (now the University Club), and favoured venue for intimate academic and social functions of University and Community groups.

⁴⁰The report presented to The City of Hamilton's Planning and Development Committee by the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC), in February of 1998, recommended designation of the historic core under the Ontario Heritage Act. Its description of the site (which, for now, is still intact), runs as follows:

The historic core of the main campus of the present-day McMaster University comprises a cluster of five Collegiate Gothic brick and stone buildings opened in 1930 (University Hall, Hamilton Hall, the Refectory and two residence) and Alumni Memorial Hall, built 20 years later in a similar style....The open space between the buildings and bordering the ravine is landscaped with grass, trees and a network of footpaths....the historic core has essentially retained its original character, notably, the harmonious relationship between the buildings and landscape.

The story of how a small group of persons promoted "selection" of a Centre site at the heart of McMaster's historic buildings, is long and complicated. I judge that the crucial decisions were made in private meetings and not documented. Records of events which apparently influenced the final site choice are numerous. So I shall not even attempt to tell that story here. Rather, I choose to comment on why I think the pre-selection was made, with minimal consultation, and what was necessary to get that decision revoked. For it seems to me that the subversion of democracy is an ever-present danger even in a University which proclaims itself a model of collegial decision-making.

Why pre-selection of a site? It's necessary if one has a predictably unpopular preference. Why minimal consultation? It's a strategy to short-circuit debate and limit consideration of alternatives. In this case, it did the opposite. The miscalculation indicates an amazing ignorance of the extent to which faculty consider the campus a communal space which profoundly influences the academic activity to which they have committed their lives. In the debate that was forced on the Administration concerning the planned demolition of the Alumni Memorial Hall, a powerful consensus emerged among opponents — who included undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, faculty, librarians, staff, local experts on architecture, and some City councillors. Briefly, the consensus was that the "historic core" of our campus should be preserved as it is and should be considered out-of-bounds for new buildings. Ultimately, and ironically, some of those who from the outset most strenuously advocated "Option C" became proponents of the site we have today and claimed credit for their perspicacity in selecting it!

In the case of the student centre site selection, distinct groups of highly educated and politically sophisticated people agreed on one point: the historic core of our campus should be preserved. They cared enough to use their voices in many different fora. They presented carefully reasoned arguments which stood the test of critical scrutiny. Reason prevailed in the end, as it should in an institution committed to its cultivation.

Why was the faculty's often expressed concern for aesthetically and culturally valuable features of the campus ignored in the closed discussions which occurred in the summer of 1997? One can only speculate about the answer. Perhaps it is simply that those who acquire power eventually wish to exercise it autonomously. (It is perhaps just as well that the MUFA presidential term is one year!) They want to be seen as decisive and to be credited with getting things done.

The University Administration has fought against designation of the historic core under the Ontario Heritage Act. There is no reason to suppose that our historic buildings are safe from deliberate on-going neglect and/or demolition. Indeed it seems that the Refectory, one of our finest buildings, is falling prey to the neglectful practices of slum landlords with the same ultimate objective in mind; to make demolition look like the only feasible course.

The MUFA Executive never promoted any particular site for the student centre. It did facilitate discussions by the membership, especially via our email forum g-mufagab. Also, information was disseminated about the decision-making process and the membership's views were reported to interested parties (e.g. to the Board of Governors).

The Executive also advocated for transparency in the decision-making process. Although some may call it a cop-out for MUFA to remain neutral on controversial issues, it is part of the tradition here to maximize direct member participation in decision-making and to protect as much member autonomy as is judged feasible. To date, I think one can say this has "worked". But as the stresses of underfunding become more intense, I think it will become harder to sustain.

I also think that MUFA should be prepared to counter more instances of autocratic and manipulative decision-making by our University administrators. Effective strategies for combating enemies of true "collegiality" are essential to MUFA's very survival. Consider the recent staff strike. Unknown to

faculty, the Administration hired a self-proclaimed strike-breaking firm to provide video surveillance of the picket lines. MUFA is to be praised for sending to the University's President and the Board of Governors the following motion unanimously approved by the MUFA membership at its Annual General Meeting on April 24, 2001:

MUFA calls upon the University not to use the services of strike circumvention companies such as Accu-Fax in future.

On the other hand, I find it disturbing that it took so long for MUFA to learn of the Administration's ill-advised and morally repugnant decision to hire Accu-Fax. It seems to me that a healthy social atmosphere in general, and good faculty relations with staff in particular, are preconditions for excellence in teaching and academic research. Faculty interests are profoundly affected by the working conditions of staff.

During my term in office, I recognized again and again that I owed a major debt of gratitude to my predecessors. They established practices which ensured that continuous discussion could occur between MUFA and senior administrators of the University. The most important contacts are the formal monthly Joint Committee meetings and the informal meetings of MUFA's President with the University President and the Provost/Vice-President (Academic). Of all such meetings the full MUFA Executive is kept informed. They in turn discuss the content of these discussions with the membership and what they gather goes back along the same route. With the advent of e-mail, faculty who wish to debate issues with colleagues can use our electronic forum g-mufagab. I found this medium invaluable for distributing information and following debate on a multitude of issues.

MUFA as an institution has maintained its initial commitment to participatory democracy. A fine example of how this works in practice was the process used to develop a revised policy on the Tuition Bursary Benefit. The MUFA Nominating Committee proposed three members-at-large; they were approved by MUFA's Executive. The committee was exemplary in collecting relevant data, soliciting members' views, and fashioning proposals that responded to the results of their inquiries. After the proposal submitted by the Committee was approved by the Executive and the Joint Committee, the membership was balloted on it. The committee's diligence was rewarded; a large majority of those who voted (90%) approved the revised policy.

In my final report to the membership as MUFA's President, I argued that it is dangerous for faculty at McMaster to assume that because we have "collegial" arrangements we need not consistently participate fully in university governance. We must never slide into complacency about the existence of collegiality or permit the substitution of intimidation for debate. The twists and turns in the site selection process which I observed close-up, and my much more restricted view of the staff strike drama, tell me that the faculty cannot flourish unless MUFA is a vigilant and powerful force on this campus. Many large numbers of MUFA's members, with a representative range of viewpoints, continue to accept the burdens and enjoy the delights of active participation in the institution's work. With such support, our venerable Association will remain vigorous; it can continue to be an effective model and proponent of democratic practices.

Les King

1998/1999

The Development of McMaster's Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy: Reflections on Twenty-five Years of Involvement

By the time I assumed the presidency of the Association in 1998, I had been involved for almost twenty-five years, along with many colleagues, in the work of fashioning and revising the University's academic appointment, tenure and promotion policy. For the first fifteen of those years I sat at the table as a member of the University's Administration; thereafter, I served in the negotiations as a representative of the Association. In the following paragraphs, I describe the major changes made to the policy over the years and certain events that prompted these changes. I pay particular attention to the subject of appeals against tenure and promotion decisions for it was on this matter that some proposals were made in 1998/99 that were discussed and agreed upon in committee but were subsequently rejected by the Association's Executive.

The First Policy Statement

In the fall of 1967 the Faculty Association pressed for the first codification of policy and procedures on tenure and promotion at McMaster by way of presenting a set of related recommendations to President Thode for consideration. Those proposals after study by senior academic administrators were referred back to the Association which, after expressing disagreement on a number of the points raised in the referral, requested the establishment of a joint committee to study the questions. This request was honoured and a joint Faculty Association/Presidential committee chaired by Manny Zack, President Thode's assistant, and comprising Gerry Chapple, Goldie French and Jack Owen for the Association and Mike Hedden, Jack Hodgins and Bill Schlatter for the President was appointed. The committee reported in April 1969 to the Association and President's Council and after their consideration of the report it ended up before Senate late that year and was eventually approved as the 1970 Policy.

The main provisions of this first statement were, 1) the drawing of a distinction between term appointments that might lead to tenure and those made for contractually limited periods; 2) the assignment of responsibilities to the "departmental chairman" for presenting recommendations on tenure and promotion to the Faculty Tenure Committee and to the divisional Vice President for carrying the Faculty committee's recommendations to Senate; 3) the spelling out of the procedures whereby Faculty Tenure Committees should consider cases for tenure and promotion; 4) the acknowledgement of the right of any candidate to meet with the "appropriate academic Vice President" to discuss "the decision concerning him" and to subsequently appeal to the Senate; and 5) the statement of procedures for the dismissal of a tenured faculty member.

The document soon proved to be long on principle but short on detail and the need for a number of procedural changes became clear early in its life. These led in turn to more substantive proposals for revision and to the establishment in late 1974 of a new joint Association/Presidential committee to study these matters. The committee comprised Frank Jones and Harold Guite for the Association and Alvin Lee and I for the President. Our deliberations lasted from November 1974 until the spring of 1976.

The Revised Policy of 1977

The fact that the discussions leading to a revised policy were so drawn out reflected both the difficulty of the negotiations on certain points and the complexity of the task. New issues were arising all the time out of the application of the existing policy that had to be addressed in the revisions. For example, in the 1975/76 year Senate received for the first time conflicting recommendations on a tenure case from its Committee on Appointments and the Faculty committee, and had to devise an *ad hoc* approach for resolving the conflict. Such matters had to be added to the committee's agenda.

The joint committee reported in April 1976 but over the following year there were further discussions and negotiations between President Bourns, Mark Levinson, President of the Association, and the Senate Committee on Appointments on a number of issues raised in the report. It was not until April 1977 that the revised document was presented in Senate but by the end of June it had won both Senate and Board approval. There were to be amendments made to the revised policy over the next four years but these did not change its major provisions.

The 1970 description of the categories of appointment was amended in two important ways. At the urging of the Administration, a new category of contractually limited appointment was added that would allow for such an appointment to be made when a commitment to a term or tenure-track one would be financially imprudent. In agreeing to this addition, the Association insisted upon the requirement that there be an annual report to Senate by the Vice-President (Academic) on the total number of contractually limited appointments made in each of the designated categories.

Then by way of an amendment approved by Senate in late 1978, there were added the new appointment categories of "special term" and "continuing appointment without annual review," that were intended to apply mainly to those situations in Health Sciences where the appointments were funded from sources outside of the University's operating budget. As an aside, I note that the records suggest that this amendment was proposed to Senate by the Dean and approved there without prior consultation with the Faculty Association. Little wonder then, that the Association's officers were so perplexed when a decade or so later some of the persons holding such appointments sought assistance from them when faced with the prospect of funding cuts and employment termination. But I leave this saga of the so-called CAWARs for others to recount.

In contrast to the 1970 policy, the revised one called for the establishment of departmental tenure committees, normally comprising only tenured faculty members. Any departure from this arrangement was subject to approval by the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee. This provision, it turned out, was to drive me out of my office for a week some years later. The events are worth recalling. For some years the Department of Sociology had student members on its departmental tenure committee, but early in 1981, Peter George as Dean of Social Sciences, informed the department that the Faculty Committee's consent to that arrangement had been withdrawn. In response, the students "occupied" the sixth floor of Kenneth Taylor Hall and blocked the use of the elevators. The President's Council on the Monday morning ordered Security to clear the building which was done. That evening the President left for China, the next morning Dean George left for a conference in Buffalo and at about 11:30 a.m. that same day the students occupied my office in University Hall where they stayed until Friday afternoon. The negotiations that led to their withdrawal focussed on the means whereby student input to tenure reviews might be ensured without requiring their actual membership on the tenure committees. Later revisions of the tenure policy formalized this process.

The 1977 document included detailed prescriptions for the work of departmental and Faculty committees in considering tenure and promotion cases and spelled out for the first time the role of the Senate Committee on Appointments in receiving and considering recommendations from the Faculty committees and then deciding on all such cases. Disagreement between a Faculty committee

and the Senate Committee would require a joint meeting of the two bodies and after that discussion, the Senate Committee would reconvene and decide the case.

The rights of an aggrieved faculty member to appeal a decision received much fuller attention than in the earlier policy statement. The euphemistic term “review” was favoured over appeal and a new separate section of the policy spelled out the procedures for Senate’s handling of requests for such reviews. Two features of these procedures were later to come under a great deal of scrutiny and be the subjects of debates that have continued up to the present day. The first concerned the type of evidence that the Review Committee could consider in a case in which a term (tenure-track) appointment was being allowed to lapse, and on this point the policy was unequivocal — “the Review Committee shall consider any new evidence”. Just how open-ended this prescription could be was to be demonstrated in some later reviews.

The second distinctive feature was the requirement that in the event that the Review Committee decided initially not to uphold the decision under review, then it had to refer the case back to either the Faculty Committee or the Senate Committee on Appointments, depending on which body had “determined” the decision. After its reconsideration, the “determining committee” had then to report its conclusions to the Review Committee which would then “decide the case”. Unfortunately, as would be demonstrated in a few years, these requirements could be followed to the letter but without proper regard for the rights of the appellant.

The dismissal procedures that had been approved as part of the 1970 policy sat unused and untried throughout the decade of the seventies. With the wisdom of hindsight, it is easy now to observe that the joint committee would have done well at the time to have left them alone. But in the spirit of producing a collegial exposition of what was intended in the policy, the committee saw fit to add a preamble in which “dismissal” was defined as “the suspension or removal” by the University of a tenured faculty member prior to normal retirement age or of any faculty appointee prior to the end of their current contract. None of us on the joint committee, nor anyone of the many persons involved in the subsequent approval of the revised policy, sensed that there was an ambiguity lurking in that definition that might give rise to difficulties. It was to prove costly to the University a decade or so later.

Stephenson v. Sanders et al. 1981; A Legal Judgement on the Review Process

Once promulgated, the 1977 review procedures were soon in use and anyone involved in academic administration in the late seventies and through the 1980s, and many of their departmental colleagues also, will have memories of hours spent in review committee hearings. There were the inevitable procedural stumbles as faculty members serving on the reviews sought to abide by the unfamiliar rules of the Ontario Statutory Powers Procedure Act, but in general the process worked satisfactorily. One aggrieved faculty member however, did not agree and decided to pursue her case in the civil courts.

In December 1978, Dr. Marylee Stephenson of the Sociology Department was informed that the Senate Committee had confirmed the decision of the Faculty of Social Sciences Tenure Committee that her term appointment should be allowed to lapse on June 30, 1979. Dr Stephenson requested a review of the decision and the three-person Review Committee chaired by Dr. E. P. Sanders, after hearing the case, upheld the decision. Dr. Stephenson’s solicitor then applied for a judicial review by the Supreme Court of Ontario and on January 7, 1981 the Court ruled that the application was allowed, that the Review Committee’s decision was “quashed with costs” and that the applicant was “entitled to another review Committee hearing, with a committee differently constituted, if she chooses to have one”. Dr. Stephenson did not choose to exercise that right.

In its review, the Court established that the Review Committee after reaching a preliminary decision

had prepared a draft report which was referred to the Dean as Chair of the Faculty of Social Sciences Committee. The Dean responded with a critique “which contained at least some new material”, following which there were “private conversations” between committee members. The Court held that the absence of any opportunity for the applicant to respond to the draft report and the Dean’s critique of it and the “secret conversations” amounted to a denial of natural justice, citing as precedent the Kane v. UBC (1980) decision.

In the aftermath of this decision, the guidelines for Review Committees, prepared by the Senate Secretariat and approved by the Senate Committee on Appointments, were amended to include the requirement that “the aggrieved faculty member must be provided with a copy of any ...communications between the review committee and the Determining Committee” (December 1984).

Once More to the Table: The 1992 Revised Policy

By the spring of 1990 the Senate Committee on Appointments had reached the conclusion that “a number of housekeeping matters and changing patterns of career development,” needed to be addressed by way of a review of the policy. In its communication to the Faculty Association it emphasized that no “questioning of the fundamental principles which inform the existing policy” was envisaged. The outcome was that in December 1990, Lorraine Allan, Chauncey Wood, Marianne [Walters] Kristofferson, Joan Morris (secretary) and I met for the first time as the new joint committee charged with considering proposals for revision of the policy.

The task turned out to be much more than one of simply taking care of “housekeeping” issues, and among the revisions that eventually won Senate approval in May 1992 were some that involved sharp departures from past practice. Specifically, on certain points having to do with time limits on appointments the “wishes of the candidate” had now to be considered. Also, the awarding of tenure to a person appointed at the Assistant Professor rank was linked now to promotion to Associate Professor, and all recommendations for tenure and promotion must be supported by written judgements from at least three external referees on the quality of the candidate’s scholarly work.

In addition, major new sections were included that described the procedures for the making of full-time appointments to the teaching staff and the nature of the academic assessments required for re-appointment, tenure and promotion. Throughout the text cross-references were given to “supplementary policy statements” (SPS) of the University that related to matters of appointment, tenure or promotion, and a list of these statements was appended to the document.

The joint committee risked being accused of having turned a blind eye to the order that it leave unaltered the fundamental principles informing the existing policy when it tackled the task of revising the review procedures. These were now to be called “appeal procedures” and a major change was introduced into the process. The tribunal hearing the appeal would now have the full responsibility for deciding whether or not the decision of the determining committee would be upheld or overturned; no referral back to the determining committee need occur; and the decision of the tribunal would be final. Surprisingly, all parties within the University agreed to the change.

The committee was equally bold, though not as persuasive, on the subject of dismissal. It was aware of the difficulties surrounding an ongoing dismissal case, that I shall refer to shortly, and sought to fashion its revisions accordingly. Dismissal was redefined strictly as the “termination” of an appointment and suspension was mentioned as an optional form of discipline that the hearing committee might choose to recommend. But it was in its statement of the process whereby dismissal and suspension would occur that the joint committee misread the mood of one important body, the Board of Governors.

The committee proposed that if the hearing committee had decided that one or the other course of action was called for, then it would forward its recommendation to the Board and, when that recommendation had been “received by the Board of Governors”, then the faculty member concerned would “be deemed” to have been dismissed or suspended as the case might be. Though the joint committee’s parent bodies — the Association Executive and the Senate Committee on Appointments — and the Senate accepted these revisions without debate, the Board did so with reservations. While approving the revised policy, it instructed its secretary to obtain legal opinion on the Board’s role in the new dismissal process.

Reshaping the Policy in the Light of the Board’s Statutory Powers

The debate in the Board over the 1992 revisions to the dismissal process had two bases, one experiential and the other legal. The experience was the Board’s recent dismissal of a tenured faculty member, while the legal issues had to do with the Board’s statutory powers under the McMaster University Act (1976).

In 1990 the President of the University had recommended the dismissal of a tenured faculty member. Under the provisions of the 1977 policy this action led to the establishment of a three-person Hearing Committee that proceeded to hear the case. When the committee came to the point of reaching its decision, difficulties arose from what a judge would later refer to as “the curious use in the...policy of the definition of the word dismissal to mean suspension or removal”. Two of the members found that “adequate cause” for dismissal had been established but could not agree on what that should mean, one argued for suspension, the other for removal. The third member did not believe that an adequate case had been made for any form of disciplinary action.

The report of the Hearing Committee prompted lengthy debate in Senate but that body eventually decided to recommend to the Board that the faculty member be removed. The Board, in turn, was troubled by the decision of the Hearing Committee and the task before them, but in the end approved the recommendation to remove the faculty member. The memory of that difficult decision was still sharp in the minds of many Board members as they debated the 1992 revisions.

The powers of the Board concerning the employment of the teaching staff are quite clearly spelled out in Section 9b of the The McMaster University Act (1976). There it is stated that “in the case of the suspension or removal of a member of the teaching staff, the Board shall prior thereto, but without limiting its power, consult the Senate”(clause 9biii). The question that now troubled many was whether the 1992 revisions, that effectively gave to the Hearing Committee the authority to sanction dismissal, constituted an abrogation by the Board of its responsibility under the Act and a delegation of its power to a Hearing Committee that it had no say in appointing.

These issues prompted the calling of a meeting of representatives of the Board, the Senate and the Association in November 1992, the outcome of which was that Lorraine Allan and I were appointed as a “drafting committee”, as called for in the 1992 Policy, to prepare amendments that would address the Board’s concerns and certain other recent proposals for change in the policy.

Emphasis was given to the need for a revision of the dismissal procedures by the judgement handed down by the Ontario Court of Justice in May 1993, that quashed the Board’s earlier dismissal and remitted the matter back to Senate “with a direction that it can impose no more serious penalty on the applicant than...suspension”. The applicant also was awarded his costs.

The mill of university governance, however, grinds very slowly as its committee cog-wheels change in composition and sharpness from year to year and it would not be until May and June of 1998 that the Senate and Board would give their approval to a revised policy that addressed the issues raised six years earlier. Fortunately, the teaching staff had been diligent and well-behaved over the period

and no one had claimed the attention of the President as a candidate for dismissal.

The 1998 Policy treats suspension and removal as two separate issues. On the former, a new section of the policy describes the procedures whereby the President might relieve a faculty member of all of his/her University duties and deny him/her access to University facilities and services for a stated period of time, with or without pay. Normally, such action by the President would be on the recommendation of a tribunal, established in accordance with an approved University policy, but provision is made for the President to suspend in “exceptional circumstances”, after appropriate consultation. The approval of these provisions by the Board required that that body delegate to the President its power to suspend a faculty member and, subsequently, by way of a by-law it has done so.

The earlier procedural/legal dilemma concerning the Board’s role in dismissal (now called removal as in the Act) also is handled by way of a delegation of power, similar to that which is called for at the level of Senate. A Hearing Committee’s decision that adequate cause for removal has been established now goes to the Senate Committee on Appointments which acts on behalf of Senate in forwarding the decision as a recommendation for removal to the Board, or one of its designated committees to which the Board may have delegated its responsibilities. The Board or its committee must then invite the faculty member or advisor to appear before it to make any representations having to do only with the process of earlier hearings and if these are convincing, then the Board or its committee must refer the matter back to the Senate Committee for advice and comment. Once this is received, then the Board or its committee must act either to remove the faculty member or to refer the recommendation back to the Senate Committee on procedural grounds. That committee would then have to decide on an appropriate course of action having to do with the Hearing Committee and its deliberations.

The 1998 Policy incorporated some other major changes. One was a set of provisions allowing for a faculty member on a tenure-track appointment to go on a reduced workload of up to fifty percent to accommodate “family responsibilities, re-direction of research or other circumstances”, which had first been fashioned by the joint committee responsible for the 1992 revisions.

Another major change had to do with the roles of the Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies in tenure and promotion cases. Ever since the approval of the 1977 policy that called for both of these officers to sit as voting members on all of the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committees and the Senate Committee on Appointments, there had been critics who warned that this arrangement could result in a denial of natural justice to a candidate. And though the argument, as I recall, had never been pressed as the basis for any tenure or promotion appeal, nevertheless it surfaced in the discussions leading up to the 1998 revisions and was championed by the Provost. The result was that that officer was removed as a member of all Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committees, but remained as an essential member of the Senate Committee; the Dean of Graduate Studies stayed as a voting member of the Faculty Committees but was now denied a vote on tenure and promotion cases at the Senate Committee level. Whether this change will result in increased variance in the standards across the Faculty committees, as I suspect it will, only time will tell.

New Proposals on the Appeals Process Lead to an Impasse

The 1998 revisions left the appeals process untouched except for some relatively minor changes relating to the issues of who should represent the determining committee in the appeal proceedings and how the Board should deal with appeal decisions that result in tenure and promotion nominations.

At the time, however, there was growing dissatisfaction especially within the Senate Committee on Appointments and the Provost’s office over two features of the process. The first was the “any new

evidence” provision of appeals against denial of tenure. Experience had shown that delays in setting up tribunals could result in their deliberations beginning a year or so after the determining committee had ruled on the case, more than sufficient time for new research papers to be written and submitted and fresh testimonials obtained. The extent to which an appellant and counsel could take advantage of this provision had been strikingly illustrated in a 1993 appeal that dragged on for 21 full days of hearings stretched out over a 15-month period.

The submission of new evidence in an appeal required a judgement of its worth on the part of the tribunal, and this was pointed to by the critics as evidence of another weakness of the process. How could a three-person tribunal, involving no one from the appellant’s discipline, properly evaluate such materials along with all of the other evidence? The criticism was pushed even further. Why should a tribunal have the authority to reconsider a case fully and arrive at a decision, binding on all parties, that might fly in the face of the judgements reached earlier at the levels of the Faculty and Senate Committees which are more broadly representative of faculty expertise?

No sooner, then, had the 1998 Policy statement been distributed, than we were back at the drafting table considering these issues. Scott Davies and I were there for the Association and Harvey Weingarten and John Weaver represented the Administration and Senate. The committee focussed on the appeals process but considered also some other matters having to do with the procedures for the review of recommendations at different levels.

On these latter items, agreement was soon reached and the proposed revisions were subsequently approved by all parties and incorporated as amendments to the 1998 Policy (September 2000). Voting rules were standardized at all levels, Faculty committees were given the responsibility for deciding on recommendations for extensions of tenure-track appointments, disagreement between a Faculty Committee and the Senate Committee would no longer call for a joint meeting of the two groups but rather a referral back with a written statement of reasons, and the requirement was added that the Senate Committee must interview candidates in certain circumstances just as the Faculty Committees are required to do.

The committee’s views on the appeals process proved to be more contentious. On the question of “new evidence” it was persuaded that anything that related to work completed after the end date of the candidate’s tenure-track appointment should be inadmissible and that scholarly work completed during the candidate’s last term of appointment should have been subjected to peer-review.

This revised definition might have won acceptance had it not been linked to the change proposed by the committee in the decision-making process of an appeal. A tribunal would no longer have the power to make a binding decision to uphold an appeal and thereby overturn the decision of the determining committee. Instead, in such an instance it would have to refer the case, along with its statement of reasons and all of the documentation tabled in the appeal, back to the determining committee. If the latter was the Senate Committee then, after its reconsideration, it would render a final decision on the case; if the Faculty Committee was the point of referral then, after its reconsideration, it would report to the Senate Committee and again that body would make the final decision.

When the above proposal was tabled in January 2000 it won cautious acceptance by the Senate Committee on Appointments, but was rejected outright by the Faculty Association Executive. It insisted that natural justice would be denied if the Senate Committee was to be given the responsibility for deciding on appeals that might well be against its own earlier decisions.

There the matter rests. The appeals process of the 1992 Policy with the minor amendments accepted in 1998 remains in force and tribunals retain the full authority to decide appeals. There is

a move afoot to establish some form of standing board of faculty members who would receive training in the conduct of appeals and from whose ranks tribunals would be appointed. That might serve to blunt the criticism of the power of the tribunals and restore confidence in a system that is an essential part of the tenure and promotion policy.

A Final Look Back

In reflecting upon my involvement in this work, I have a great deal of satisfaction and some regrets. I think the University has an excellent policy in place and I am pleased to have been a party to the joint efforts of the Administration and the Faculty Association that produced it. There are now clauses in the concluding section of the document that formalize this co-operation and spell out the means whereby further revisions may be considered. But without the goodwill and determination of all parties to respect the policy and make it work, many of its key provisions could soon be eroded away. I hope this does not happen.

I have two main regrets. The first is that we never succeeded in embracing part-time faculty members within the reach of the policy. Efforts were made but soon abandoned and the only recognition in the existing policy of part-time status is of those holding appointments that require “the equivalence of three-quarter service”. Those other part-time instructors, upon whom there is an increasing reliance within the University, must look elsewhere for recognition and protection of their employment rights. My other regret, is that in fashioning a policy that was protective of faculty rights and due process, we did not succeed in keeping it as a strictly collegial one with only colleagues and peers involved. Appeals are now conducted by lawyers, often quite unfamiliar with university policy and practices and too often adept at deliberating in “glacial slowness”, to quote one observer. Whether at the outset, when the 1977 Policy was adopted, we could have barred lawyers from the proceedings, notwithstanding that document’s recognition of the Ontario Statutory Powers Procedures Act, is a moot point worthy now of discussion only in the club bar. *Tant pis.*

Acknowledgement

I extend a very warm vote of thanks to Joan Morris, Secretary of Senate, not only for the assistance which she has given me in preparing this piece but also on behalf of all faculty members for her dedicated and valuable service on the drafting committees over the years and for her skill and perseverance in guiding the revisions through the tortuous channels of approval.

John Platt

1999/2000

Although I had been a member of MUFA since coming to McMaster in 1971 and had represented MUFA for several years on the President's Users' Parking and Traffic Committee and the Parking Appeal Board, I had not served on the Executive or otherwise been involved in the operation of MUFA. I was thus somewhat surprised when Les King walked into my lab one afternoon and indicated that the MUFA Nominating Committee would like me to stand for election to the office of Vice-President. He assured me that knowledge of how the University operated was much more important to the office than past experience in MUFA. He also told me a pack of lies about there being very little work to be done relative to the teaching release which would be forthcoming.

I must admit that in my early years at McMaster I had a lingering suspicion that the MUFA Executive was probably populated by some chronic malcontents who were more interested in breeding dissension and advancing left-leaning ideals than in forwarding their own academic careers or the well being of the Academy. The fact that a number of colleagues I held in high regard had served as MUFA Presidents had long ago dissuaded me from these earlier suspicions. Thus, after some thought, I agreed to accepting the challenge of serving in the progression of Vice-President, President and Past-President.

My first year on the MUFA Executive, as Vice-President, started as a desperate attempt to "learn the ropes" before becoming President. Les King and Phyllis DeRosa-Koetting were most helpful in this respect. I quickly learned that the President did not have to know much about the history or operation of the Association, because it is really run by Phyllis who can make any information required appear almost magically from her vast files. Those files are a fundamental reference relied upon by many people in the University, even those outside the Association.

The most visible activities in the Association during that first year concerned remuneration negotiations in the Joint-Committee. Les King had persuaded David Hitchcock to serve as Remunerations Chair for these negotiations, a match that turned out not to have been made in heaven. As Vice-President I was the third member of the negotiating team and was rather looking forward to having a ring-side seat for a face-off between the sage former Provost and the new young Provost at the negotiation table. That did not turn out to be the way things went, but the story of those negotiations is not mine to tell.

As even casual observers will remember, things really heated up following a remuneration agreement being reached in the Joint Committee. After signing the agreement reached in the Joint Committee, MUFA's Remuneration Chair was apparently persuaded by some other members of the Remuneration Committee that the agreement was a bad one and he decided to renounce it. There ensued a rather acrimonious debate in anticipation of balloting by the membership on ratification of the agreement. When the vote was finally held, 205 ballots were cast in favor and 78 against. On the one hand, this was the best participation rate that anyone could remember, but it also represented the highest rate of opposition (27.6 %) to a remuneration agreement in the history of the Association.

The timing of our remuneration negotiations is such that we are the first of our sister associations to conclude negotiations. This both brings some pressure from other associations to provide a pace-setting agreement that they can use to advantage in their own negotiations, and lack of the clear yardstick that would be provided by comparing our agreement to those obtained by other faculty associations. In view of the turmoil surrounding our agreement in 1998/99, I carefully followed

subsequent settlements in other institutions and examined recent comparisons of our salaries with those of others. I conclude that, although our agreement was certainly not the best that anyone obtained, it was not the worst and served to maintain a favourable comparison between our salaries and those at other universities which might be regarded as comparable.

Whether the financial outcome was good or bad, the acrimony surrounding that agreement was certainly not desirable. In his final President's Report, Les King attributed many of these problems to uncertainties within MUFA about the selection of the Remuneration Committee and its role in the negotiation and ratification process. In response to a resolution passed at that Annual General Meeting, the MUFA Executive appointed an *ad hoc* committee, chaired by Bernadette Lynn, to clarify the selection and role of the Remunerations Committee in subsequent negotiations. Although I am far from certain that this is really what went wrong with the process, these clarifications have been approved by the membership and should help avoid misunderstandings between the various players in subsequent negotiations.

Perhaps the most visible events of my year as President surrounded a strike by the CUPE local representing teaching assistants (TAs). As it became increasingly likely that a strike would occur, the Association began to receive a number of inquiries from members about various aspect of their rights and obligations in the event of a strike. Many of these questions centred on whether a faculty member could be required to do the work of a striking TA. Some were also concerned about what retribution could be taken against them if they were to support the strike in various ways. A quick examination of existing University and MUFA policies turned up nothing that directly addressed the rights and obligations of MUFA members during a strike by another group of University employees. I met with Provost Harvey Weingarten and suggested that the two of us might formulate and issue a joint statement on this matter. He opted against this approach on the grounds that "some things were better left unsaid."

There clearly was need for a basis on which to advise members of their rights and obligations as a strike became imminent. Phyllis found a resolution on this subject that had been adopted by CAUT several years previously. It was a short statement that clearly indicated the right of faculty members and librarians to refuse to do the work of a striking worker and also recognized the right to follow one's individual conscience in supporting strikers in various legal ways, such as not crossing or joining picket lines, without fear of reprisal, provided that one might expect to lose a day's pay for any day on which the member's scheduled obligations were not fulfilled. The MUFA Executive discussed the situation and decided to follow a long tradition of not becoming involved in the labour issues of another group, but to vigorously support the academic freedom of our members to voice and legally act upon their individual views without fear of reprisal. In support of these goals, the Executive adopted the CAUT resolution as its official position during the TA strike and also resolved to negotiate a standing policy on these issues in the Joint Committee once the strike was concluded.

This action and the CAUT resolution were circulated to the membership and the University administration. I believe this action served the membership well and allowed members to freely express their individual views. There are of course segments of the membership at either extreme of the social/political continuum who felt that the Executive had done either too much or too little in adopting that stance, but that will always be the case. Interestingly, the Provost who had expressed no interest in issuing a joint statement on faculty rights and obligations before the strike, did express interest in negotiating such a policy during the strike. We indicated our desire to negotiate such a policy, but declined to do so in the heat of a strike in progress.

Another interesting development during the strike was the suggestion by a group of MUFA members for MUFA to have a panel discussion on the rights and obligations of members during work stoppages by other groups. These members also contacted James Turk, the Executive Director of CAUT, and obtained his agreement to participate on such a panel. Although it appeared likely that the strike

would end before such an event could be scheduled, the MUFA Executive enthusiastically embraced this suggestion as a way to inform the negotiation of a Joint Committee policy on this topic once the strike was concluded. A panel representing a diverse range of opinion on this topic was organized and the discussion was held shortly after the end of the strike. This event was well attended by MUFA members, including the Provost. I believe those attending found the evening worthwhile and it did serve to inform our subsequent negotiation of a policy in the Joint Committee.

Those negotiations proceeded directly in the Joint Committee. So much discussion had already occurred that for the most part the negotiations proceeded expeditiously and captured the basic tenets of the CAUT resolution which the MUFA Executive had already adopted. There was one sticking point during those negotiations. The CAUT resolution indicated the right of members to refuse to work under unsafe conditions resulting from a strike by another group. The MUFA component insisted that such a clause be included in the policy being negotiated and the Administration component refused to agree to such a clause. I shall not attempt to represent the Administration position on this issue, but it seemed to revolve around difficulties in defining “unsafe”, and problems as to who was to make the determination. Just when the deadlock appeared to be hopeless, the MUFA contingent suggested that unsafe conditions were only one of several possible conditions beyond a member’s control that could prevent the member from fulfilling a scheduled obligation. Another example given was being detained in a traffic backup caused by picket lines. We thus proposed an alternative clause stating that the clause about losing a day’s pay for not fulfilling or making alternative arrangements for a scheduled obligation did not apply if the precipitating circumstances were beyond the member’s control. Somewhat to our surprise, the Administration accepted this approach and the negotiations were concluded.

Finalization of these negotiations and ratification of the resulting policy extended beyond my Presidency into Bernadette Lynn’s. During her term a similar policy was negotiated for librarians, just in time for a strike by MUSA members. I believe these policies have served well during both of those difficult and contentious times. No general policy gives a crystal clear answer to all questions that might arise, but these have stood the test of providing a framework within which the Association can advise its membership during work stoppages by other groups with some reasonable expectation as to the consequences of that advice. I am not aware of any faculty member or librarian who has been disciplined for actions taken during either of these strikes. Perhaps our ability to defend a member under these policies would be the real acid test, but I would like to think that the policies sufficiently inform both the MUFA membership and the University Administration that such a situation is unlikely to arise.

One of the more interesting dynamics of MUFA is the manner in which issues and attempts to deal with them cut across the terms of successive Association Presidents and Executives. As terms for presidents of faculty associations go, our one-year term is a very short one. This probably reduces the effectiveness of our role in larger organizations such as OCUFA and CAUT, but also reduces the likelihood of a particular personality dominating the Association. At the same time, the mechanism of moving an individual through the offices of Vice-President, President and Past-President in successive years seems to provide sufficient continuity to deal with most ongoing issues.

One area in which this rapid turnover of MUFA leadership may prove to be a problem in the future is that of remuneration negotiations. Both at McMaster and elsewhere there is an emerging trend to multi-year remuneration agreements. Such agreements conserve considerable effort on the part of both the Association and the University Administration and are helpful to long-range budgetary planning. However, they also create a situation in which there is likely to be no overlap between the Executive negotiating one agreement and that negotiating the next. I believe the Association needs to provide mechanisms for issues and experience gained to be transmitted from one negotiation to the next. One way to do this would be for each negotiating team to leave an informal written account of its experiences for the next. Another possibility would be to appoint some members of

the previous negotiating team to the Remunerations Committee for the subsequent negotiation.

In any case, the manner in which issues often take longer to be resolved than the term of one President means that any account of events during my term begins during the terms of my predecessors and/or ends during the terms of my successors. One example of this is provided by attempts to achieve a distribution of the Pension Plan surplus. This story goes back at least to the Presidency of Daphne Maurer and the court case concerning the University's right to take contribution holidays. The Association lost that point in court, but gained a clear statement that the University could not withdraw the surplus without Plan members' consent. This eventually led to the establishment during the presidency of Les King of a committee representing the various stakeholder groups and the University to negotiate an equitable distribution of the surplus.

As I became President of the Association, these negotiations were seeking to balance various improvements to pension benefits with a cash withdrawal to provide an endowment to the University. Negotiations were floundering and finally stalled on the issue of relative shares for Plan members and for the University. We and the other Plan-member groups insisted on a 50-50 split with the University, while the University Administration sought a larger share. Many of us had to forcefully make the point that an agreement which could not be represented as at least an equal split between Plan members and the University was not sellable. The University negotiators finally relented and agreed to the principle of making the actuarial value of pension benefit improvements equal to the cash value of an endowment for the University.

Just as an agreement was within sight, consultation with external experts indicated that the whole approach of using Plan members' share of the surplus to improve pension benefits was too complex and would not be able to obtain the necessary approvals. This was one of the most disappointing days of my presidency. The extremely large amount of surplus in the Pension Plan was well beyond that needed for contribution holidays and was really not doing anyone any good. An equal sharing of some of this surplus between Plan members and the University was clearly to everyone's benefit. Fortunately, the committee negotiating this arrangement started over and eventually arrived at a simple 50-50 cash deal which was approved by both Plan members and the University during the presidency of Bernadette Lynn. The fate of that agreement now rests with the courts and various government agencies. The final outcome will not be known until well into the presidency of Tom Davison. The real hero of this pension surplus story is another former MUFA President, Les Robb, who represented the Association in this matter for the entire duration of the process which extended over almost four years.

Another major issue during my presidency was also inherited from my predecessors. Several years before my term, librarians became part of MUFA's membership. The primary goals of this realignment were to achieve recognition of the academic nature of their positions and to provide for more effective negotiation of their remuneration. To these ends the Administration/Librarians Negotiating Committee was established. A major task assigned to this committee was to review all University policies and negotiate changes appropriate to the academic status of librarians. In some cases this simply involved adding librarians to an existing policy, while in others it was necessary to modify a policy or develop an entirely new one to deal adequately with this new status for librarians. This was a long process extending over three years. Throughout that time librarians were ably represented by Liz Bayley and Carl Spadoni. In the first year MUFA was represented by Les Robb and Bernadette Lynn. As Vice-President, I replaced Les Robb as co-chair of the Committee and negotiations were finally concluded toward the end of that year. It was not until my presidency that these policies were finally all put in place. At this time there was also a desire on the part of both MUFA and the University Administration to establish a mechanism for translating negotiated changes in faculty remuneration directly into corresponding changes in librarian remunerations without having to conduct a second set of negotiations from scratch. The broad outline of such a procedure was worked out during my presidency, but was not finally concluded and put into effect until the term

of Bernadette Lynn.

Yet another multi-term issue during my presidency was a major review of our Career Progress/Merit model. This model of course prescribes the mechanism by which faculty members are assigned merit and career progress increases in remuneration. One of the arguments offered by the University Administration for a multi-year remuneration agreement was to allow time free from remuneration negotiations to deal with other matters such as a review of the CP/M model. I felt that this model was a good one which had served both the membership and the University well. I was thus somewhat suspicious of the Administration's eagerness to review the policy. Provost Harvey Weingarten repeatedly assured me that he had no particular agenda for revision in mind and it was agreed in the Joint Committee to establish an *ad hoc* committee to perform such a review. Representatives on that committee were Provost Harvey Weingarten and Dean Alan Harrison for the Administration and Bernadette Lynn and myself for the Association. Work of this committee was slowed considerably by the distractions of the TA strike. Nevertheless, we did manage to conduct most of the review during my term. It was agreed that the model was indeed a good one, but that there was some wording in the document which tended to cause confusions, and the model was stated in terms of a very out of date numerical example. The wording of the document was simplified and clarified. The model itself was restated in more general mathematical terms, instead of a specific numerical example which was bound to become dated. Most of the drafting for this revised document was done by Alan Harrison. The revised document was finally approved by the membership and the Board of Governors during Bernadette Lynn's term as President.

One could get the impression from what has been said that, although significant issues tend to cut across the terms of more than one MUFA President, they tend to be resolved in a fairly timely fashion. This is not always the case. For several years before I became President, the need had become obvious for a policy enshrining the right to privacy with respect to electronic communications such as e-mail. Little had come of several previous attempts to obtain such a policy. Certainly one of the problems was that such a policy was really needed for all members of the University community, not just faculty and librarians. In the meantime some other issues of personal privacy had come to the fore. One of these concerned putting some conditions and limitations on video surveillance which was coming into much more general use on campus for security purposes. Another issue was the privacy of information held on University servers in space assigned to individual members of the University community.

During my term as President we once again raised these personal privacy issues in the Joint Committee. It was decided that a good way to deal with them would be in the context of a revision of the University's Guidelines on Access to Information and Protection of Privacy. The University Freedom of Information and Privacy Protection Officer and the Secretary of the Board of Governors were thus requested to develop a revision of that policy which would include the new concerns. An early sign of difficulties with this approach occurred when the Secretary of the Board of Governors sent an e-mail to the Provost recommending that any revision of the document continue to be restricted to University records. This would of course prevent including consideration of the new issues which had been raised. The Provost instructed the Secretary to continue with the original mandate for revision. However, when a recommendation was presented almost a year later, it called for no revision of any kind to the policy. Once again our attempt to have these issues of personal privacy addressed in University policy had come to nothing. The current Joint Committee continues to look for an effective route to deal with these issues, but it is difficult to be optimistic about an early resolution.

If this account of my journey through the inner workings of MUFA has a moral, I think it is that the real strength of the Association lies in its tenacious continuity. Those who drafted the By-Laws of the Association had the foresight to create a careful balance between moving individuals fairly rapidly through the governing structure of the Association while creating just enough serial overlap to

provide for continuity in dealing with issues. It is a tribute to all who have served in this structure that this intent continues to be fulfilled.

Bernadette Lynn

2000/2001

Since it was my brilliant idea in Fall 2000 to solicit MUFA's Past Presidents to contribute reminiscences on their years leading the Association, it is only fitting that I, as MUFA President for 2000/2001, record my presidential experiences for MUFA's 50th Anniversary *Festschrift*.

Previous to my three-year commitment to the MUFA presidency (Vice President, 1999/2000; President, 2000/2001; Past President, 2001/2001), I had served on the MUFA Executive several times. The relationship between MUFA and the University Administration has changed in many ways during the twenty years in which I have been involved with the Association. During my first stint on the Executive in the early 1980s, MUFA and the University were continually at loggerheads. Collegiality existed between faculty members, but not universally between faculty and administrators. While the Joint Committee existed, negotiations were not taken seriously and faculty suffered imposed salary settlements and were infrequently consulted in the overall operations of the University, except in Senate, and then only on purely academic matters. To alleviate this unhealthy atmosphere, the Tripartite Agreement was negotiated and signed in the 1980s, committing MUFA and the Administration to a time-limited negotiating procedure with a dispute resolution mechanism (final offer selection) should negotiations fail. Moreover, the Joint Committee itself took on an expanded and more proactive role, becoming a forum to discuss faculty issues relating to their terms and conditions of employment even if these did not relate directly to salary negotiations. In my four years on the Executive in the late 1980s and early 1990s, I witnessed first-hand the enhanced role of the Joint Committee and more importantly the effectiveness of the Tripartite Agreement. Sadly, the Social Contract years of the early 1990s created an unnatural bargaining environment, and the enforced budget reductions of the Common Sense Revolution in 1995 further hampered our faculty position. Nevertheless, the Joint Committee continued as a place to discuss faculty issues openly and frankly. When I again joined the Executive in 1996/97 and 1997/98 as Remuneration Chair, I felt part of a Joint Committee that operated collegially and considered faculty issues seriously.

When I was elected to the MUFA Executive as Vice President in 1999/2000, MUFA had just signed a three-year salary agreement about which many faculty members were far from pleased. This, however, turned out to be one of the minor annoyances of my time on the Executive in 1999/2001.

I presumed (wrongly it seems) that since a three-year salary agreement meant a relatively quiet period for the Joint Committee *vis à vis* salary negotiations, we on the Executive and at the Joint Committee could spend more time on other issues which affect faculty in the University. Looking back from Spring 2001, I realize that my optimism was naive and I was unprepared for the level of labour unrest which erupted at McMaster in the next two years. During my Vice Presidency there were several strikes on campus, the most visible of which was the Teaching Assistants' strike in December 1999. John Platt, MUFA President in 1999/2000, brought forward a proposal for a policy on "The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members during Work Stoppages" following the settlement of the TA strike. This was discussed by the MUFA Executive and brought to the Joint Committee early in the new year (2000). In Spring 2000, it was announced that MUSA had certified as a union and it became more imperative that a policy on faculty rights and responsibilities be agreed on. At the same time the Joint Committee was working on revisions to the CP/M Policy to clarify language and bring it up to date.

The first part of my presidency in 2000 was relatively uneventful. We heard periodically through the summer and fall of 2000 that MUSA negotiations were not going well and we were apprised in Spring 2000 of the results of an extensive staff survey which revealed the intense and generalized

dissatisfaction of McMaster staff. We understood the significance of this information and tried to learn about the problems which MUSA and the Administration faced in their attempts to negotiate a first contract.

The beginnings of my presidency were grounded in small events which reflected more profound and significant issues. One, the Mactron (an electronic scoreboard donated to the University under an agreement to broadcast commercial messages from the donor), was an eyesore which flashed commercial messages night and day at the Business building and adjacent parking lot. It not only visually offended faculty, staff, and students, but also homeowners who lived next to the University. Through MUFA's efforts the electronic scoreboard was moved and the advertisements curtailed. Decidedly, the Mactron issue was a minor one, but it reflected a larger issue, that is, the commercial threat to the academic endeavour, i.e. commercialization of the University.

The Mactron issue offered an entrance to the debate on how far universities should go in selling themselves for private donations. Should a university accept donations when there are strings attached which limit academic freedom? This question is a pertinent one and requires University members to undertake fundraising with their eyes open. Increasingly, the funding crisis in Ontario universities creates the potential for deal-making that could injure the academic credibility of institutions. We at McMaster have noticed peripheral deals such as advertisements in washrooms, TV monitors in cafeterias and a Coca Cola monopoly on campus, which do not directly impinge on academic life, but which may foreshadow future agreements which do, in fact, limit academic pursuits.

Such issues as commercialization were the "stuff" of Fall 2000 on the MUFA Executive. By November 2000 the policy on "Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty during Work Stoppages" was completed by the Joint Committee, approved by the MUFA Executive and sent out to faculty members for their approval. Both "The Rights and Responsibilities" document and the CP/M revisions were approved by the MUFA membership in December 2000. In the meantime, the Library Negotiating Committee began to negotiate a parallel policy for MUFA librarians to provide them with a delineation of their rights and responsibilities during work stoppages by union groups on campus. It was necessary to conduct these librarian negotiations speedily, since by January 2001, relations between the MUSA and University bargaining teams had deteriorated greatly. The possibility of a MUSA strike was becoming imminent. The Librarians Negotiating Committee exchanged drafts of the policy, and with the outstanding work of Nora Gaskin and Carl Spadoni, the MUFA librarians policy was approved on the day the MUSA strike was announced in March 2001. (Talk about eleventh hour negotiations!)

The MUSA strike was the nadir of my MUFA presidency. The MUFA Executive had been kept abreast of MUSA negotiations by both sides — the negotiators from MUSA and those from the Administration. The Executive and I saw that negotiations to reach an agreement on a first contract had reached an impasse. Both sides were adamant about the appropriateness of their positions, and it had become very difficult for either MUSA or the University Administration to compromise. Certainly, the longstanding unhappiness of MUSA, caused by what they believed was lack of respect for them and their contribution to the University, created a very unhealthy negotiating atmosphere as well as a loss of trust in the University Administration.

We on the MUFA Executive were dismayed at the MUSA strike vote and its consequent work action. The MUFA Executive tried to maintain a neutral position on the strike, encouraging both sides to work toward a negotiated settlement at the bargaining table. Many faculty members chose to exercise their rights during the strike, refraining from crossing the picket line, holding classes off campus, cancelling classes, and even reorganizing their class exams. One of the issues that arose came from faculty members, especially untenured ones, who felt threatened in taking action in support of the strike. The MUFA Executive tried to communicate to its members that the Policy on

Rights and Responsibilities defined the potential cost to them to support the strike action, namely the loss of a certain amount of pay. Nevertheless, some members still felt exposed to some vague “disciplinary action” despite the fact that I had assurances from the Provost that our policies defined the potential extent of action that could be taken if members did not perform their duties during the strike. Sadly, even though we tried to explain the policy to our members, some did not believe our interpretation.

Despite these problems in the University, I was impressed, as MUFA President, by the openness and collegiality that MUFA and the University Administration had developed since my first experiences with MUFA in the 1980s. Understandably MUFA and the Administration do not always agree, but we have been able to discuss our differences, argue our respective positions and maintain our mutual respect for each other. One of the areas where I saw this collegiality manifested was in revisions of the Tenure and Promotion document which took place over the years 1997 to 2000. The joint Senate/MUFA drafting committee had suggested a revision to the Appeals Procedure in the Tenure document, taking the final decision for an appeal away from the Appeal Tribunal and moving it back to the original committee that had made the negative decision. The MUFA Executive opposed this change arguing that it introduced bias and denied the appellant natural justice. MUFA suggested that perhaps better trained tribunal members would answer the defects in the current procedure that motivated the change recommended by the drafting committee.

In fact the T&P revisions went forward to Senate in 2000 without any change to the appeal procedure. Plans are underway to develop a trained hearings panel drawn from all parts of the University that would be used for the many types of hearings (tenure and promotion appeals, grievance, research ethics, etc.) described in our policies. I believe the results of MUFA collaborating with the University Administration may provide a result superior to one where any of the parties acted alone.

Another area where we have had a major success in 2000/2001 is in the MUFA librarian process for future negotiations. Since May 1995 when many McMaster librarians chose to align themselves with MUFA, we have conducted negotiations a number of times, over both salary and policy issues. It has been MUFA’s belief that librarians’ salary and benefit negotiations should be linked to faculty negotiations. Since MUFA librarians are not covered by the Tripartite Agreement under which faculty negotiate, we have had to negotiate separately for librarians outside the Joint Committee process. We have now come to an agreement on a formula to link MUFA librarian salary negotiations to those agreed to in the Joint Committee. This will indirectly bring the librarians under the aegis of the Tripartite Agreement and its dispute resolution procedure and protect them from the potential of imposed settlements. This agreement was reached collegially through discussion and debate. It will allow MUFA librarian negotiations to concentrate on policy areas relevant to them and spend less time repeating the salary and benefits negotiations already undertaken in the Joint Committee.

I approached my year as President of MUFA with much trepidation. One of the major areas to which MUFA had to lend its support was the negotiation of, and subsequent agreement to, the sharing of a portion of the McMaster Pension Surplus. Les Robb served as the MUFA representative (and official spokesman for the Pension Members Group) on the committee that negotiated the pension surplus sharing agreement and oversaw the communication of the agreement and the voting on it by members.

My year as President of MUFA in 2000/2001 has had its high points, such as signing of the preliminary agreement on the pension surplus, and it has had its low points as in the MUSA strike. The poor morale of returning MUSA staff and the unhappiness of some faculty that MUFA did not take a more active role in supporting the MUSA strike (and the anger of some faculty that we took too strong a position during the strike) has created a turbulent environment at McMaster which I hope will create

positive changes. I am an optimist and somewhat old fashioned in that I believe discussion of issues can lead to resolution and improvement, given willingness and good faith on both sides. What McMaster will look like in five or ten years is at once a matter of speculation and planning. To maintain our academic excellence and our strong reputation, we at MUFA need to be continuously vigilant and ensure that faculty have a strong voice in all aspects of the University operation. In my year as MUFA President, I tried to do this and I realize that sometimes I was successful and at other times stumbled a bit. I learned, however, that being MUFA President means representing McMaster faculty, not representing myself. The diversity of views among McMaster faculty is only imperfectly reflected by the MUFA Executive, and trying to represent these differences was the exciting and frustrating part of being MUFA President. Harvey Weingarten, Provost during my MUFA presidency, insisted continuously that MUFA is too democratic while I reminded him that democracy is MUFA's strength.

What will McMaster look like in five to ten years? I hope its faculty still operate collegially. I hope it continues and improves its recruitment of first class students and that it is able to renew itself with first class faculty appointments. I hope that MUSA staff will reach an agreement which creates an environment that respects and values its contributions. I hope that McMaster's research efforts move it to the top position in Canada (we are only fifth or sixth currently in 2001). Finally, I hope my presidency of MUFA and all my previous efforts on the Executive help to strengthen the organization and make it vital to its members.

Appendix

A. Presidents of MUFA

1951/52	A.E. Johns	Mathematics
1952/53	E.T. Salmon	Classics
1953/54	R.M. Wiles	English
1954/55	R.C. McIvor	Economics
1955/56	M.W. Johns	Physics
1956/57	F.W. Waters	Philosophy
1957/58	J.D. Bankier	Mathematics
1958/59	J.E.L. Graham	Economics
1959/60	H.A. Dulmage	Philosophy
1960/61	H.E. Duckworth	Physics
1961/62	H.W. McCready	History
1962/63	H. Kleerekoper	Biology
1963/64	N.D. Lane	Mathematics
1964/65	R.W. Thompson	Economics
1965/66	A.H. Black	Psychology
1966/67	J.S. Kirkaldy	Metallurgy
1967/68	G.S. French	History
1968/69	B.W. Jackson	English
1969/70	D.W. Carment	Psychology
1970/71	F.N. Shrive	English
1971/72	N. Rosenblood	English
1972/73	W.D.G. Hunter	Economics
1973/74	G.W. King	Chemistry
1974/75	F.E. Jones	Sociology
1975/76	G. Field	Applied Mathematics
1976/77	M. Levinson	Civil Engineering
1977/78	H.F. Guite	Classics
1978/79	T.C. Truman Term I	Political Science
	H.F. Guite Term II	Classics
1979/80	M. Walters (Kristofferson)	Psychiatry
1980/81	S.F.H. Threlkeld	Biology
1981/82	D.M. Winch	Economics
1982/83	P.L. Newbigging	Psychology
1983/84	D.R. Inman	Neurosciences
1984/85	D.A. Dawson	Economics
1985/86	J.M. Jones	Social Work
1986/87	G.W. King	Chemistry
1987/88	H.P. Schwarcz	Geology
1988/89	J.N.A. Lott	Biology
1989/90	D.M. Maurer	Psychology
1990/91	G.K. Smith	Psychology
1991/92	E.E. Daniel	Biomedical Sciences
1992/93	D. Blewett	English
1993/94	S. Siegel	Psychology
1994/95	L. Allan	Psychology
1995/96	H. Jacek	Political Science
1996/97	A. L. Robb	Economics
1997/98	C. Beattie	Philosophy
1998/99	L. J. King	Geography & Geology
1999/2000	J. Platt	Psychology
2000/01	B. Lynn	Accounting
2001/02	T. M. K. Davison	Mathematics & Statistics

B. MUFA Executive Members

1951/1952

President	A. E. Johns (Mathematics)
Vice-President	F. W. Waters (Philosophy)
Secretary/Treasurer	M. Stock (Romance Lang)
Conditions of Work	G. S. French (History)
External Relations	L. H. Cragg (Chemistry)
Salaries and Pensions	F. W. Waters (Philosophy)
Scholarly Finance	R. M. Wiles (English)
University Policy	W. J. McCallion (Math & Sci)
No portfolio specified	J. E. L. Graham (Economics) H. W. McCready (History)

1956/1957

President	F. W. Waters (Philosophy)
Secretary	R. P. Graham (Chemistry)
Treasurer	H. J. Alderson (Nursing)
Conditions of Work	G. G. Harrop (Divinity)
Salaries	J. E. L. Graham (Economics)
Scholarly Finance	C. W. Murphy (Chem Eng)
Special Enquiries	R. W. Thompson (Economics)
No portfolio specified	P. R. Clifford (Geography) H. W. McCready (History) N. D. Lane (Mathematics)

1952/1953

President	E. T. Salmon (Classics)
Vice-President	H. W. Lang (Divinity)
Secretary/Treasurer	W. J. McCallion (Math & Sci)
Conditions of Work	G. S. French (History)
External Relations	L.H. Cragg (Chemistry)
Salaries and Pensions	R. C. McIvor (Economics)
Scholarly Finance	R. M. Wiles (English)
University Policy	D. M. Shaw (Geology)
No portfolio specified	J. E. L. Graham (Economics) M. W. Johns (Physics) H. W. Lang (Divinity) A. Reid (Nursing)

1957/1958

President	J. D. Bankier (Mathematics)
Vice-President	H. W. Lang (Divinity)
Secretary	D. M. Shepherd (Classics)
Treasurer	H. J. Alderson (Nursing)
Campus Problems	J. W. Hodgins (Engineering)
Salaries	J. E. L. Graham (Economics)
Special Enquiries	D. Novak (Political Science)
Pensions & Insurance	R.W. Thompson (Economics)
No portfolio specified	P.R. Clifford (Geography) N. D. Lane (Mathematics) H. W. McCready (History) C. W. Murphy (Chem Eng) F. W. Waters (Philosophy)

1953/1954

President	R. M. Wiles (English)
Vice-President & Scholarly Finance	M. W. Johns (Physics)
Secretary	G. G. Harrop (Divinity)
Treasurer	W. J. McCallion (Math & Sci)
Conditions of Work	A. P. Martin (German)
External Relations	J. E. L. Graham (Economics)
Salaries & Pensions	R. C. McIvor (Economics)
Special Enquiries	D. M. Shaw (Geology)
No portfolio specified	A. N. Bourns (Chemistry) H. E. Duckworth (Physics) H. W. McCready (History) L. Tupper (Divinity)

1958/1959

President	J. E. L. Graham (Economics)
Vice-President	H. A. Dulmage (Philosophy)
Secretary	H. A. Wood (Geography)
Treasurer	H. J. Alderson (Nursing)
Campus Problems	R. E. Jones (Classics)
Pensions and Insurance	B. Banaschewski (Math)
Salaries	R. C. McIvor (Economics)
Special Enquiries	H. C. Kitchen (Divinity)

1954/1955

President	R. C. McIvor (Economics)
(All records, minutes, Newsletter missing from files)	

1959/1960

President	H. A. Dulmage (Philosophy)
Vice-President	H. E. Duckworth (Physics)
Secretary	H. A. Wood (Geography)
Treasurer	F. Greenaway (Nursing)
Campus Problems	J. Noxon (Philosophy)
Pensions	C. C. Potter (Commerce)
Salaries	F. E. Jones (Sociology)
Special Enquiries	G. P. Albaugh (Divinity)

1955/1956

President	M. W. Johns (Physics)
(All records, minutes, Newsletters missing from files)	

1960/1961

President	H. E. Duckworth (Physics)
Vice-President	H. W. McCready (History)
Treasurer	F. I. Greenaway (Nursing)
Campus Problems	F. N. Shrive (English)
Pensions	C. C. Potter (Commerce)
Salaries	P. L. Newbigging (Psychology)
Special Enquiries	G. G. Harrop (Divinity)
No portfolio specified	D. D. Stewart

1961/1962

President	H. W. McCready (History)
Treasurer	D. Davidson (Biology)
Pensions	C. C. Potter (Commerce)
Salaries	M. A. Preston (Physics)
Special Enquiries	F. N. Shrive (English)
University Government	H. Kleerekoper (Biology)

1962/1963

President	H. Kleerekoper (Biology)
Vice-President	R. F. Aldwinckle (Divinity)
Past-President	H. W. McCready (History)
Secretary	G. Laurion (Romance Lang)
Treasurer	M. Kutschke (Nursing)
Pensions	C. C. Potter (Commerce)
Salaries	N. D. Lane (Math)
Special Enquiries	J. S. Kirkaldy (Metallurgy)
University Government	B. Banaschewski (Math)
No portfolio specified	C. M. Johnston (History) D. M. Shaw (Geology)

1963/1964

President	N. D. Lane (Math)
Vice-President	G. P. Grant (Religion)
Past-President	H. Kleerekoper (Biology)
Secretary	H. Robinson (Civil Engineering)
Treasurer	E. Wardwell (Psychology)
Pensions	R. W. Thompson (Economics)
Salaries	W. D. G. Hunter (Economics)
Special Enquiries	C. C. McMullen (Physics)
University Government	A. H. Black (Psychology)
No portfolio specified	A. W. Brink (English) H. W. Lang (Divinity) R. C. McIvor (Economics)

1964/1965

President	R. W. Thompson (Economics)
Vice-President & Pensions	A. I. Johnson (Chem Eng)
Past-President	N. D. Lane (Mathematics)
Secretary	H. Robinson (Civil Engineering)
Treasurer	A. Jamieson (Mills Library)
Salaries	W. D. G. Hunter (Economics)

Special Enquiries	A. E. Combs (Religion)
University Government	A. H. Black (Psychology)
No portfolio specified	B. N. Brockhouse (Physics) G. P. Grant (Religion) I. C. Morgan (Divinity) F. N. Shrive (English)

1965/1966

President	A. H. Black (Psychology)
Vice-President	J. S. Kirkaldy (Metallurgy)
Past-President	R. W. Thompson (Economics)
Secretary	O. R. Morgan (French)
Treasurer	A. Jamieson (Library)
Pensions	B. N. Brockhouse (Physics)
Salaries	K. L. Murphy (Chem Eng)
Special Enquiries	A. E. Combs (Religion)
Television	B. A. W. Jackson (English)
University Government	G. S. French (History)
No portfolio specified	M. J. S. Ford (Divinity) H. Robinson (Civil Engineering)

1966/1967

President	J. S. Kirkaldy (Metallurgy)
Vice-President & Univ. Government	G. S. French (History)
Past President	A. H. Black (Psychology)
Secretary	L. McDonald (Sociology)
Treasurer	H. E. Turner (History)
Pension	L. J. Kamin (Psychology)
Salaries	K. L. Murphy (Chem Eng)
Special Enquiries	M. J. S. Ford (Divinity)
Without portfolio	I. Litvak (Commerce) D. R. McCalla (Biochemistry) O. R. Morgan (French) D. M. Shepherd (Classics)

1967/1968

President	G. S. French (History)
Vice-President	L. J. Kamin (Psychology)
Past President	J. S. Kirkaldy (Metallurgy)
Secretary	L. McDonald (Sociology)
Membership	A. I. Johnson (Chem Eng)
Pensions	D. M. Winch (Economics)
Salaries	J. R. Allan (Economics)
Special Enquiries	H. E. Turner (History)
Television	B. W. Jackson (English)
University Governance	I. A. Litvak (Commerce)
Without portfolio	L. I. Greenspan (Religion) D. R. McCalla (Biochemistry) J. R. C. Perkin (Divinity)

1968/1969

President	B. W. Jackson (English)
Vice-President	J. R. Allan (Economics)

Past President G. S. French (History)
 Secretary M. Halsall (English)
 Treasurer J. P. Liefeld (Commerce)
 Membership J. R. C. Perkin (Divinity)
 Pensions D. M. Winch (Economics)
 Salaries D. W. Carment (Psychology)
 Special Enquiries C. G. Chapple (German)
 University Government G. S. Vichert (English)
 Without portfolio S. Ajzenstadt (Philosophy)
 D. H. Carr (Anatomy)
 G. V. Middleton (Geology)

1969/1970

President D. W. Carment (Psychology)
 Vice-President F. N. Shrive (English)
 Past-President B. W. Jackson (English)
 Secretary J.D. Browning (Romance Lang)
 Treasurer V. Warrior (Classics)
 Educational TV R. Pritchard (Psychology)
 Membership/Newsletter J. Kirkaldy (Metallurgy)
 Salaries J. Liefeld (Business)
 Special Enquiries N. Rosenblood (English)
 University Budget H. Wood (Geography)
 Without portfolio L. Siegel (Psychiatry)
 W. D. G. Hunter (Economics)
 G. Albaugh (Divinity College)
 E. Cappadocia (History)
 S. Ajzenstat (Philosophy)

1970/1971

President F. N. Shrive (English)
 Vice-President V. Warrior (Classics)
 Past-President D. W. Carment (Psychology)
 Secretary D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
 Treasurer/Sabbaticals G. A. Warner (Romance Lang)
 Salaries & Pensions W. D. G. Hunter (Economics)
 Special Enquiries N. Rosenblood (English)
 Without portfolio G. G. Harrop (Divinity)
 G. V. Middleton (Geology)
 G. R. Winham (Political Sci)

1971/1972

President N. Rosenblood (English)
 Vice-President W. D. G. Hunter (Economics)
 Past-President F. N. Shrive (Psychology)
 Secretary T. R. Hobbs (Divinity)
 Membership G. Warner (Romance Lang)
 Sabbaticals L. Greenspan (Religion)
 Salaries G. King (Chemistry)
 Special Enquiries M. Levinson (Civil Eng)
 No portfolio specified M. Flood (Sociology)
 K. Freeman (Biochemistry)
 D. R. Inman (Biomedical Sci)
 J. Kirkaldy (Metallurgy)
 D. Winch (Economics)

1972/1973

President W. D. G. Hunter (Economics)
 Vice-President G. Warner (Romance Lang)
 Past-President N. Rosenblood (English)
 Secretary G. Purnell (English)
 Treasurer & Membership D. Jensen (Biology)
 Pension S. Mestelman (Economics)
 Sabbaticals G. Sweeney (Medicine)
 Salaries C. Borgsdorf (Business)
 Special Enquiries M. Levinson (Civil Engineering)
 Without portfolio G. Field (Applied Math)
 L. Greenspan (Religion)
 G. W. King (Chemistry)
 D. Winch (Economics)

1973/1974

President G. W. King (Chemistry)
 Vice-President F. E. Jones (Sociology)
 Past-President W. G. D. Hunter (Economics)
 Secretary G. Thomas (Russian)
 Treasurer & Membership R. B. Bohn (Nursing)
 Pensions S. Mestelman (Economics)
 Salaries H. A. Wood (Geography)
 Tenure T. C. Truman (Political Sci)
 Without portfolio D. M. Shaw (Geology)
 W. J. Slater (Classics)
 G. Purnell (English)
 T. R. Hobbs (Divinity)

1974/1975

President F. E. Jones (Sociology)
 Vice-President G. Field (Applied Math)
 Past-President G. W. King (Chemistry)
 Secretary G. Winham (Political Sci)
 Treasurer & Membership J. J. Emery (Civil Eng)
 Pension H.A. Wood (Geography)
 Salaries M. Levinson (Civil Eng)
 Tenure T. Truman (Political Science)
 Without portfolio D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
 M. Shaw (Nursing)

1975/1976

President G. Field (Applied Math)
 Vice-President M. Levinson (Civil Eng)
 Past-President & Special Enquiries F. E. Jones (Sociology)
 Secretary E. Nardocchio (Rom Lang)
 Treasurer J. J. Emery (Civil Eng)
 Membership J. Westermann (Biology)
 Pension H. Wood (Geography)
 Salaries A. L. Robb (Economics)
 Tenure H. F. Guite (Classics)

Without portfolio R. Adams (Business)
T. R. Hobbs (Divinity)
G. W. King (Chemistry)
M. Shaw (Nursing)
R. Slobodin (Anthropology)

Without portfolio G. G. Erasmi (Romance Lang)
H.C. Jain (Business)
M. Levinson (Civil Engineering)

1976/1977

President M. Levinson (Civil Eng)
Vice-President/Tenure H. F. Guite (Classics)
Past-President G. Field (Applied Math)
Treasurer/Membership J. Westermann (Biology)
Secretary/Pensions A. K. Steigerwalt (Business)
Public Relations D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
Salaries A. L. Robb (Economics)
Special Enquiries & Grievances T. Truman (Political Science)
Without portfolio J. J. Emery (Civil Eng)
D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
S. M. Najm (Philosophy)
E. Nardocchio (Romance Lang)
G. Thomas (Russian)
J. M. E. Watts (Nursing)
P. Younger (Religion)

1979/1980

President M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)
Vice-President S. F. H. Threlkeld (Biology)
Past-President & Tres H. F. Guite (Classics)
Secretary & Membership A. S. Whiteside (Rom Lang)
By-Laws M. Levinson (Civil Eng)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy H. C. Jain (Business)
Collective Bargaining K. R. Nossal (Political Science)
Financial Exigency D. M. Winch (Economics)
Public Relations E. Wightman (History)
OCUFA Director D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Pension and Benefits D. M. Maurer (Psychology)
Salaries D. A. R. Kay (Met & Mat Sci)
Tenure G. K. Smith (Psychology)
Without portfolio J. P. Carbotte (Physics)

1977/1978

President H. F. Guite (Classics)
Vice-President T. Truman (Political Science)
Past-President M. Levinson (Civil Engineering)
Secretary & Pension A. K. Steigerwalt (Business)
Treasurer S. M. Najm (Philosophy)
Academic Affairs G. Thomas (Russian)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy N. D. Lane (Mathematics)
Collective Bargaining T. Lewis (Political Science)
Membership J. M. E. Watts (Nursing)
Public Relations S. Link (Psychology)
Salary J. Burbidge (Economics)
Special Enquiries & Grievances D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Tenure J. P. Carbotte (Physics)
Without portfolio M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)

1980/1981

President S. F. H. Threlkeld (Biology)
Vice-President/Tres D. M. Winch (Economics)
Past-President M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)
Secretary/CAUT & OCUFA Policy/PR D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Academic Affairs J. E. Thomas (Philosophy)
Membership & Newsletter Editor D. Barrett (History)
OCUFA Director F. E. Jones (Sociology)
Pension and Benefits P. L. Newbigging (Psychology)
Personal Files Access A. S. Whiteside (Rom Lang)
Salaries D. A. R. Kay (Met & Mat Sci)
Tenure G. K. Smith (Psychology)
Without portfolio S. N. Laiken (Finance)
S. M. Najm (Philosophy)

1978/1979

President T. Truman (Pol Sci) Term I
H. F. Guite (Classics) Term II
Vice-President M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)
Secretary & Members D. Maurer (Psychology)
Treasurer R. Welke (Business) Term I
L. Greenspan (Rel) Term II
Newsletter E. Wightman (History)
Pension and Benefits Policy S. Link (Psychology)
G. Thomas (Russian)
Public Relations K. Nossal (Political Sciences)
Salaries J. J. Emery (Civ Eng) Term I
D. A. R. Kay (Mat Sci) Term II
Special Enquiries & Grievances G. Field (Applied Math)
Tenure J. P. Carbotte (Physics)

1981/1982

President D. M. Winch (Economics)
Vice-President/Pension & Benefits P. L. Newbigging (Psychology)
Past-President S. F. H. Threlkeld (Biology)
Secretary J. E. Thomas (Philosophy)
Treasurer W. G. Roebuck (English)
Academic Affairs S. Panagiotou (Philosophy)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Membership & Newsletter Editor D. Barrett (History)
OCUFA Director J. B. Rose (Industrial Relations)
Public Relations J. N. A. Lott (Biology)
Salary D. A. R. Kay (Met & Mat Sci)
Special Enquiries & Grievances A. B. Kristofferson (Psychology)
Tenure D. Novak (Political Science)

1982/1983

President	P. L. Newbigging (Psychology)
Vice-President	D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Past-President	D. M. Winch (Economics)
Secretary/Academic Affairs & Membership	F. N. Shrive (English)
Treasurer	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy	L. A. Branda (Biochemistry)
Newsletter	C. Beattie (Philosophy)
OCUFA Director	J.B. Rose (Industrial Relations)
Pension & Benefits	P. Macdonald (Math Sci)
Public Relations	J. N. A. Lott (Biology)
Salary	D. A. R. Kay (Met & Mat Sci)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	A.B. Kristofferson (Psychology)
Tenure	G. K. Smith (Psychology)

1983/1984

President	D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Vice-President	D. A. Dawson (Economics)
Past-President	P. L. Newbigging (Psychology)
Secretary/Membership	F. N. Shrive (English)
Treasurer	E. A. Csordas (Accounting)
Academic Affairs	A. Berland (English)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy	D. Davidson (Biology)
Cultural Affairs	S. Panagiotou (Philosophy)
Pension & Benefits	R. J. Adams (Industrial Rel)
Public Relations	W. G. Roebuck (English)
Salary	D. A. R. Kay (Met & Mat Sci)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	G. Field (Applied Math)
Tenure	D. W. Carment (Psychology)

1984/1985

President	D. A. Dawson (Economics)
Vice-President & PR	J. M. Jones (Social Work)
Past-President	D. R. Inman (Neurosciences)
Secretary/Membership	R. H. Johnston (History)
Treasurer	E. A. Csordas (Accounting)
Newsletter	W. G. Roebuck (English)
Pension & Benefits	B. Latto (Mech Eng)
Salary	G. R. Piercy (Metallurgy)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	D. R. Counts (Anthropology)
Tenure	H. P. Schwarcz (Geology)
Without portfolio	D. W. Carment (Psychology)
	R. H. McNutt (Geology)
	J. J. Rice (Social Work)

1985/1986

President	J. M. Jones (Social Work)
Vice-President	G. W. King (Chemistry)
Past-President	D. A. Dawson (Economics)
Secretary/Treasurer	I. Krinsky (Finance)

Academic Affairs	R. M. Brown (Nursing)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy	D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
Membership	J. J. Rice (Social Work)
Pensions & Benefits	R. H. McNutt (Geology)
Public Relations	W. G. Roebuck (English)
Salary	G. R. Piercy (Metallurgy)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	A. Berland (English)
Tenure	H. P. Schwarcz (Geology)
Without portfolio	H. C. Jain (Business)

1986/1987

President	G. W. King (Chemistry)
Vice-President	H. P. Schwarcz (Geology)
Past-President	J. M. Jones (Social Work)
Secretary/Treasurer	R. Kitai (Electrical Engineering)
Academic Affairs	E.J.E. Szathmary (Anthropology)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy	R.H. Johnston (History)
Membership	L. W. Belbeck (Pathology)
Pension & Benefits	I. Krinsky (Finance)
Public Relations	R. W. Vince (English)
Salary	J. C. Gaa (Accounting)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	J. N. A. Lott (Biology)
Tenure	J. B. Lawson (German)

1987/1988

President	H. P. Schwarcz (Geology)
Vice-President	J. N. A. Lott (Biology)
Past-President	G. W. King (Chemistry)
Secretary/Treasurer	L. W. Belbeck (Pathology)
Academic Affairs	W. Waluchow (Philosophy)
Membership	M. Dokainish (Mech Eng)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy	R. H. Johnston (History)
Public Relations	R. Vince (English)
Remuneration	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Special Enquiries & Grievance	B. A. Levy (Psychology)
Status of Women	M. Ahmed (Romance Lang)
Tenure	D. R. Counts (Anthropology)
Without portfolio	J. G. Miltenburg (Business)

1988/89

President	J. N. A. Lott (Biology)
Vice-President	J. Rose (Industrial Relations)
Past-President	H. Schwarcz (Geology)
Secretary/Membership	R. Korol (Civil Engineering)
Treasurer	L. Belbeck (Pathology)
Academic Affairs	I. Zeytinoglu (Industrial Rel)
CAUT & OCUFA Policy	R. H. Johnston (History)
Pension	D. Welland (Economics)
Public Relations	M. Sproule-Jones (Pol Sci)
Remuneration	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	P. Macdonald (Math & Stats)

Status of Women M. Ahmed (Romance Lang)
 Tenure G. K. Smith (Psychology)

1989/1990

President D. M. Maurer (Psychology)
 Vice-President G. K. Smith (Psychology)
 Past-President J. N. A. Lott (Biology)
 Treasurer B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
 Academic Affairs H. Jain (Human Resources)
 Membership M. Taylor (Geography)
 CAUT & OCUFA Policy D. Geagan (History)
 Pension G. Field (Engineering)
 Public Relations D. A. Dawson (Economics)
 Remuneration D. A. R. Kay (Materials Sci)
 Special Enquiries & Grievances M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)
 Status of Women M. O'Connor (English)
 Tenure D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)

1990/1991

President G. K. Smith (Psychology)
 Vice-President E. E. Daniel (Biomedical Sci)
 Past-President/Pension D. M. Maurer (Psychology)
 Treasurer B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
 Academic Affairs M. Taylor (Geography)
 CAUT & OCUFA Policy D. Geagan (History)
 Membership O. Turan (Mechanical Eng)
 Public Relations T.M.K. Davison (Math& Stats)
 Remuneration W. Lewchuk (Labour Studies)
 Special Enquiries & Grievances M. Keyes (Physical Education)
 Status of Women E. Inman (Drama)
 Tenure M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)
 Without portfolio D. Welland (Economics)

1991/1992

President E. E. Daniel (Biomedical Sci)
 Vice-President D. Blewett (English)
 Past-President G. K. Smith (Psychology)
 Treasurer T.M.K. Davison (Math&Stats)
 Academic Affairs H. Jacek (Political Science)
 CAUT & OCUFA Policy D. Geagan (History)
 Membership L. Schnell (English)
 Public Relations P. Smith (Elec& Com Eng)
 Remuneration R. Hackett (Hum Resources)
 Special Enquiries & Grievances W. G. Roebuck (English)
 Status of Women E. Inman (Drama)
 Tenure A. P. Hitchcock (Chemistry)
 Without portfolio R. Pallister (Nursing)

1992/1993

President D. Blewett (English)
 Vice-President S. Siegel (Psychology)
 Past-President E. E. Daniel (Biomedical Sci)
 Treasurer H. Falk (Business)
 Academic Affairs M. O'Donnel (Biology)
 Joint Committee A. P. Hitchcock (Chemistry)
 Membership H. Jacek (Political Science)
 Public Relations P. Walmsley (English)
 Remunerations M. Veall (Economics)
 Special Enquiries & Grievances J. Clinard (Classics)
 Status of Women S. Watt (Social Work)
 Tenure W. G. Roebuck (English)
 Without portfolio B. Latto (Mechanical Eng)

1993/1994

President S. Siegel (Psychology)
 Vice-President L. G. Allan (Psychology)
 Past-President D. Blewett (English)
 Treasurer J. Clinard (Classics)
 Academic Affairs S. Watt (Social Work)
 Membership R. Alden (Elec&Com Eng)
 OCUFA Director M. Kristofferson (Psychiatry)
 Pension M. Dooley (Economics)
 Public Relations D. Gupta (Business)
 Remuneration W. Lewchuk (Labour Studies)
 Status of Women A. St.Leger Lucas (French)
 Special Enquiries & Grievances A. P. Hitchcock (Chemistry)
 Tenure C. Beattie (Philosophy)

1994/1995

President L. G. Allan (Psychology)
 Vice-President H. Jacek (Political Science)
 Past-President S. Siegel (Psychology)
 Treasurer D. Simeoni (French)
 Academic Affairs D. Gupta (Business)
 Human Rights R.H. Johnston (History)
 Membership D. Pengelly (Medicine)
 OCUFA Director M. Walters
 (Kristofferson)(Psychology)
 Pension M. Dooley (Economics)
 Public Relations J. Donaldson (English)
 Remuneration A. L. Robb (Economics)
 Special Enquiries & Grievances D. Ford (Geography)
 Tenure D. Weaver (Mechanical Eng)

1995/1996

President H. Jacek (Political Science)
 Vice-President A. L. Robb (Economics)
 Past-President L. G. Allan (Psychology)

Treasurer	W. Wiesner (Hum Resources)
Academic Affairs	F. L. Hall (Geog/Civ. Eng)
Human Rights	D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
Library	Term I: V. Parke (Innis) Term II: E. Hayton (Mills)
Membership	D. Pengelly (Medicine)
OCUFA Director	B. Smyth (Computer Science)
Pension	S. Cheung (Fin & Bus Econ)
Public Relations	R.H. Johnston (History)
Remuneration	W. Lewchuk (Labour Studies)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	L. Greenspan (Religious Stds)
Tenure	A. St. Leger Lucas (French)

1996/1997

President	A. L. Robb (Economics)
V-P/Treasurer	C. Beattie (Philosophy)
Past-President/OCUFA Director	H. Jacek (Political Science)
Academic Affairs	V. Aksan (History)
Human Rights	W. Warry (Anthropology)
Library	E. Hayton (Library)
Membership	D. Pengelly (Medicine)
Public Relations	R. H. Johnston (History)
Remuneration	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	L. J. King (Geography)
Tenure	J. Roberts (Nursing)
Without portfolio	A. St. Leger Lucas (French) J. Shedden (Psychology)

1997/1998

President	C. Beattie (Philosophy)
Vice-President/SEGC	L. J. King (Geography/Geology)
Past-President/Pension	A. L. Robb (Economics)
Treasurer	M. Parsons (Nursing)
Academic Affairs & OCUFA Director	D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
Human Rights	R. Howard (Sociology)
Library	E. Hayton (Mills)
Membership	W. Warry (Anthropology)
Public Relations	J. Donaldson (English)
Remuneration	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	J. Roberts (Nursing)
Tenure	R. S. Davies (Sociology)
Without portfolio	D. Jones (Computer Sci&Sys)

1998/1999

President	L. J. King (Geography/Geology)
V-P/Academic Affairs	J. Platt (Psychology)
Past-President/OCUFA Director	C. Beattie (Philosophy)
Treasurer	M. Parsons (Nursing)
Human Rights	D. Jones (Computer Sci&Sys)

Library	K. Ball (Innis)
Membership	G. Steiner (Mgmt Sci&Info Sys)
Pension	A. L. Robb (Economics)
Public Relations	J. Donaldson (English)
Remuneration	D. Hitchcock (Philosophy)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	M. Dooley (Economics)
Tenure	R. S. Davies (Sociology)
Without portfolio	P. Chow-Fraser (Biology)

1999/2000

President	J. Platt (Psychology)
V-P/Treasurer	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Past-President	L. J. King (Geology/Geography)
Acad Aff/Remuneration	S. Miller (Political Science)
Human Rights	C. Bryne (Nursing)
Library	K. Ball (Thode)
Membership	G. Bone (Mechanical Eng)
OCUFA Director	K. Cruikshank (History)
Pension	K. Nainar (Accounting)
Public Relations	P. Chow-Fraser (Biology)
Special Enquiries & Grievances	M. Dooley (Economics)
Tenure	S. Elliott (Geography/Geology)
Without portfolio	S. Birch (CE & B)

2000/2001

President	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Vice-President	T.M.K. Davison (Math & Stats)
Past-President/SEGC	J. Platt (Psychology)
Treasurer	B. Kaczynski (History)
Academic Affairs	S. Miller (Political Science)
Human Rights	C. Bryne (Nursing)
Library	C. Spadoni (Mills)
Membership	G. Bone (Mechanical Eng)
OCUFA Director	K. Cruikshank (History)
Pension	K. Nainar (Accounting)
Public Relations	M. Lovric (Math & Statistics)
Remuneration	S. Birch (CE & B)
Tenure	S. Elliott (Geography & Geol)

2001/2002

President/Pension	T.M.K. Davison (Math & Stats)
Vice-President	L. G. Allan (Psychology)
Past-President & Remuneration	B. E. Lynn (Accounting)
Treasurer	B. Kaczynski (History)
Academic Affairs	N. McLaughlin (Sociology)
Human Rights	N. Galleguillos (Pol. Science)
Library	C. Spadoni (Mills)
Membership	M. Parsons (Nursing)
OCUFA Director	K. Cruikshank (History)
Public Relations	T. Petric (Materials Sciences)
Tenure	M. Lovric (Math & Statistics)
Without portfolio	M. Veall (Economics)

C. MUFA Staff

July 1974 - September 1975	Dolores Smith , Executive Assistant
September 1975 - June 1989	Joan (Beckett) Field , Executive Assistant
January 1987 - February 1988	Margaret Forrest , Secretary (Part-Time)
February 1988 - December 1991	Betty May Lamb , Executive Assistant
March 1989 - present	Kelly McCaughey , Secretary (Part-Time)
November 1991 - present	Phyllis DeRosa-Koetting , Executive Assistant